The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME VI | New York, Saturday, March 18, 1916 | Number 72

Contents

Editorial Notes 164
Leading Editorials
- The Way of the Neutral 167
- For Better Administration 168
- Commerce After the War 170
- The Child Labor Bill 171

General Articles
- Eight-Hours for Railway Crews ..... W. Jett Lauck 173
- John Thorton—a Portrait ..... Richard David Brooke 175
- Negro Segregation in St. Louis ..... Roland G. Usher 176
- Miss Lowell and Things ..... Walter Lippmann 178
- The New Return to Nature ..... Leo D. Stein 179

Washington Notes ..... W. L. 181
Correspondence 182
Books and Things ..... P. L. 191
Reviews of Books
- A Great Game ..... F. H. 192
- The Mechanics of Democracy ..... H. J. L. 193
- Modified Feminism ..... L. C. 194
- What Is Insanity? ..... H. S. 195

AMERICANS disposed to criticize their government and their countrymen for their attitude towards foreign affairs have no reason to complain of the action of Congress or of the Administration on the occasion of the recent culmination of the border troubles between the United States and Mexico. With practical unanimity it was decided that Villa must be put out of the way and that the job must be undertaken by American troops; at the same time there was every disposition to make reasonable concessions to Mexican national pride and to allow the Carranza government to present the best possible face to its own people and to the world. In exchange for the privilege of permitting American troops to pursue Mexican outlaws into Mexican territory the Mexicans have obtained the right to pursue American outlaws into American territory. Thus the expedition does not become an act of war against Mexico, and the possibility remains open of confining it to its proper purpose of punishing Villa and his band, and of obtaining some security against the repetition of such acts. At the same time the danger that the work of punishing Villa may keep American troops in Mexico for a long time, and is likely to result in the assumption of the more difficult task of policing the border states, has been fully recognized. The United States has had a dangerous and a costly job forced upon it, a job which might involve the temporary military occupation of some of the territory of a disorderly neighbor. It has accepted the burden with reluctance but without hesitation and without any intention of making it a pretext for the subjugation of Mexico.

BENEATH the surface of the reluctant assumption of a disagreeable duty there have of course been unloosed many conflicting feelings, ambitions and plans. There are a certain number of eastern Americans who have been hypnotized into the desire for war by reading the headlines about European battles, and who are really delighted at the prospect of fighting somebody—even if it is only a band of ragged outlaws. There is a larger group who have been trying for years to bring about intervention and who are determined to keep American troops on Mexican soil until they occupy Mexico City. On the other hand, there is another group who are against any effective intervention at any price and will seek to treat the Villa raid as an isolated occurrence, which can be closed as soon as Villa himself is captured or killed. We trust that none of these groups will dictate the policy of the government. It is a crude statesmanship which confines itself to the alternatives of complete intervention or absolute non-intervention. A form of intervention which necessitates the military occupation of a large part of Mexico is to be avoided, if humanly possible, but the United States has every justification in policing the border states until a stable and authoritative government is established throughout the rest of Mexico. The Villa incident is not isolated. It has been preceded by others almost as abhorrent, and these incidents will be repeated after Villa is eliminated—repeated, that is, unless the border states are restored to order. The United

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States should seize this opportunity to furnish sufficient protection for the lives of American citizens and to restore peace along its own frontier. At the same time it would be contributing most effectively to the restoration of order throughout the whole of Mexico. The intrinsic difficulties and the huge expense of putting down the rebellion in Northern Mexico is ruining the Carranza government, and is making any general reconstruction impossible. Carranza might have at least a small chance of pulling through in case the American Government should temporarily assume the job of policing Sonora and Chihuahua.

LULLS in the fighting at Verdun were to be expected; for it has been evident since the first two days of the attack that the reduction of the stronghold was to be effected, according to the plans of the Imperial Staff, by assaults repeated at intervals and in each case preceded by artillery preparation and infantry reconnoissance. Supplies of munitions had to be renewed, artificial defenses destroyed, and reserves brought forward with a view to immediate deployment. In fact it has already been shown over and over again that Verdun or any other position can be taken by this method provided the price in casualties be paid. But Ypres was never taken because that price was found to be too high, and the Germans may stop before Verdun for the same reason. No one knows how many men Falkenhayn is losing. Less without doubt than the French report, these losses may notwithstanding be far greater than the Germans expected, and entirely out of proportion to the military advantage to be gained, just as were the German losses before Ypres. In fact it is becoming more and more probable that the capture of Verdun would be a barren victory, equally without military or moral results. Very possibly these attacks are welcome to General Joffre, a mere expenditure of German strength. Other methods than these must be resorted to, if a decision is ever to be reached on the western front. For whether or not Verdun falls, the progress of the German operations is too slow.

ONE would have supposed that ex-President Taft was the last man qualified to express a judgment on Mr. Louis D. Brandeis. For if Mr. Taft will search his memory he will remember that it was Mr. Brandeis who caught him in what is perhaps the most discreditable episode in which a President of the United States has been involved. We have no desire to rake up mud from the past, but when Mr. Taft sets himself up as a censor of manners and morals, it becomes necessary to remind him that he antedated a public document in the Ballinger case, that he deceived the public in regard to his action, that he tried to conceal his deception with a falsehood. If Mr. Taft does not like Mr. Brandeis the human explanation is exceedingly simple. It was Mr. Brandeis who demonstrated to the country Mr. Taft's immoral procedure in a disreputable incident.

OF the other gentlemen who have expressed their opposition we admire particularly the judicial temperament of Mr. Peter Meldrim of Savannah, Georgia. Mr. Meldrim opposes the nomination because of what he calls Mr. Brandeis's reputation at his home bar. This amounts to saying that if enough people will make enough allegations against a man, that in itself disqualifies him. Mr. Meldrim does not say that he knows anything about Mr. Brandeis or that he has investigated the charges. With the high regard for truth which often entitles a conservative to attack a liberal Mr. Meldrim announces that, because there is an opposition to Mr. Brandeis, he personally believes there is sufficient reason to prevent the confirmation. The fantastic nature of such a position makes a person wonder whether the nomination of Mr. Brandeis has destroyed not only the sense of justice but the common sense of some of the archaic members of the American bar.

IN nominating Mr. Allen Benson for President, the Socialists have done more than select their ablest pamphleteer. They have declared against an increase of armaments, and for all practical purposes suppressed that small faction headed by Mr. Charles Edward Russell which has advocated preparedness. Mr. Benson ought to make an excellent campaign. He does not suffer from a Marxian technique. He talks the language of American radicalism, and his approach is more like that of the older muckrakers than of the hard intellectualists who constitute the priesthood of socialism. Mr. Benson will carry much conviction because he begins not with a few concepts about property and the class struggle, but with a rough-and-tumble experience of American business and politics. His nomination may be said to mark a stage in socialist history, for his predecessor, Mr. Eugene V. Debs, belonged to an earlier American tradition, to the evangelist radicalism of the Middle West. He had a great heart, and those who knew him loved him. Mr. Benson is admired, and is likely to be feared.

THE agitation for increased armaments was certain to produce many wild suggestions, but it remained for the conference of mayors at St. Louis to insist upon the most mischievous. In the resolutions "unanimously adopted" it is announced that "we [i. e., mayors and mayors' com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mittees] believe that the navy should be increased with all speed until we shall have become the first naval power of the world, with strength on the Atlantic equal to that of any other power upon that ocean, and with additional strength upon the Pacific such as to make of us the first naval power upon that ocean." In other words, a navy larger than those of Britain and Japan combined. How long do the mayors think it would take to build such a fleet? What do the mayors think Britain and Japan would be doing while we were building it? And even supposing the project weren't a mad impossibility, what kind of security do the mayors think the United States would have if it suddenly challenged the united naval power of the world? For if America ever undertook such a program, Britain and Japan could with perfect justice declare war on us before we got started, and suppress us as an international nuisance. If this is the best the mayors can do, they had better confine themselves to the problems of the City Hall.

DO you recognize old friends as "Potasch *u.* Perlemoer"? This is the way our lively compatriots Potash and Perlmutter are now disporting themselves at The Hague. Blockade and contraband may be affecting the intercourse between this country and other neutrals, but no great restrictions have been placed on American novelists and playwrights. As "Onkel Langben" the Danes have been seeing "Daddy Longlegs." In Stockholm "Annonsera" is the present title of "It Pays to Advertise." "The Harbor," by Ernest Poole, is offered daily to the readers of the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* and Burton E. Stevenson has a serial in the Christiania *Tidens Tegn*. After our own long course of importations from abroad, it is agreeable to realize we are returning the compliment. But shall we blame Europeans for continuing to call us dollar-chasers when we send them such a protestation of national vulgarity as "It Pays to Advertise"?

SUPPOSE that upon the restoration of peace economic conditions in Europe assume such a character that the anticipated influx of labor into America fails to take place—what will happen to our industries, deprived of their ordinary supply of cheap labor and forced to adjust themselves to a lower price level? According to the general view they will be forced to curtail operations, and depression will be upon us. This was the belief of the South African mine owners in 1904 when they forced a reluctant Empire to accept the institution of coolie labor. They still held it in 1911 when the impractical theorists who had risen to political power forced the repatriation of the 50,000 coolie laborers employed in South Africa. Was production reduced? Not materially. All manner of labor-saving devices were introduced, and South African prosperity proved to be as solidly based upon free, high-paid labor as it had been on servile, low-paid labor. In the long run it does not make a great difference to industry whether labor is cheap and ineffectively used or dear and used with effectiveness. It does make a vast difference to the state, and to humanity at large.

IN the latest *Unpopular Review* we have encountered an extremely able and cogent article on eugenics, "Your Blood and Mine," which would never have appeared there if the editor were taking his gospel of reaction as seriously as do some of his contributors. Laissez-faire as a policy of population leads straight to perdition, according to this writer. The defective element in our population amounts to four per cent of the whole; it overcrowds our jails and asylums, and inflicts upon us an actual cash burden in excess of the cost of our army. Imbecility breeds imbecility as certainly as white hens breed white chickens; and under laissez-faire imbecility is given full chance to breed, and does so in fact at a rate far superior to that of able stocks. The burden is progressive. All this and much more contained in the writer's argument is true; why is it that it does not stir the intelligent public to action? We may suggest that a socialized policy of population cannot be built upon a laissez-faire economic policy. So long as the state neglects its good blood, it will let its bad blood alone. There is no certain way of distinguishing between defectiveness in the strain and defectiveness produced by malnutrition, neglected lesions originally curable, or overwork in childhood. When the state assumes the duty of giving a fair opportunity for development to every child, it will find unanimous support for a policy of extinction of stocks incapable of profiting from their privileges.

ONE of the most serious industrial situations in the history of the country is that precipitated by the nation-wide demand of railway employees for an eight-hour day. A universal railway strike would cause unthinkable hardship. It is important that public opinion, which will be so influential in the settlement, should be well informed as to the merits of the case. The contention of the employees is presented on page 173 of this issue by Mr. W. Jett Lauck, an expert on railway economics for the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen in their eastern arbitration of 1913, and for both the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Firemen in the western arbitration of 1915. In a subsequent article the case of the railroads will be presented by an equally competent authority.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Way of the Neutral

AS the war drags on and as its ultimate controversies in their effect on this country are laid bare, its meaning for Americans has become increasingly clear. Since August, 1914, the majority of the American people have been loyally seeking, as all their national interests and traditions have bound them to seek, some counsel of perfect neutrality. The search has not succeeded. The more meticulously they have kept in the path of neutrality, the more they have been reproached with sinful irregularities. Neutrality according to law was constantly involving actual unneutrality. The alternative of converting neutrality into a policy of perfect impartiality involved the denial of plain legal obligations. The way of the neutral was beset with as many pitfalls as the way of the transgressor and with as many obstacles as the way of the righteous. The experience raises the question how far a nation can be honestly neutral in relation to a conflict which imperils so much of the welfare of so many million people now and hereafter.

The pending issue with Germany over armed merchant vessels illustrates very well the difficulty of combining neutrality with impartial justice. The Government of the United States has been laboring to secure guarantees from Germany that the submarines in their operation against commerce would conform to the law of visit and search. But the instructions issued to the captains of merchant vessels by the British Admiralty authorize them to consider the approach of a submarine which was loyally conforming to the law of visit and search as a hostile act. Thus a submarine which obeys the law is treated as a pirate, and a merchant vessel's "defensive" armament becomes as a consequence of the British official instructions an actual weapon of offense. Such a state of facts seems to justify the German contention—but what is the alternative? If the captains of armed merchant vessels are instructed to consider the approach of a submarine as a hostile act, the commander of the submarine seems to have a sufficiently good excuse to torpedo such a vessel without warning. Yet this alternative involves as many difficulties as the other. How is the captain of the submarine to tell whether the merchant vessel is armed or not? The German Government has not and cannot give a satisfactory answer to this question. The submarine commander would be unable to discriminate between armed and unarmed vessels without being able to visit and examine them. If he once began to torpedo ships on suspicion he would fall into frequent and costly mistakes. As a consequence, the seas during war would practically be appropriated by the belligerents, and neutrals could not travel or trade without exposure to appalling risks.

Under such conditions what is the way of the perfect neutral? Superficially the ugly series of dilemmas originates in the orders of the British Admiralty to the captains of merchant vessels; and the American Government has apparently sufficient reasons for refusing to accept any responsibility for the fate of vessels whose commanders were instructed to employ their defensive armament as a weapon of attack on an approaching submarine. But such an official repudiation of the armed merchant vessel is as doubtfully just as would be official approval of the Admiralty's instructions to British merchant mariners. As a matter of fact, the merchant vessel for centuries had a right to defensive armament, and this right has not, as the Germans claim, become obsolete. It has survived as a protection for merchant mariners against a possible abuse of power by their captors. No body of noncombatants can be reasonably required to submit their lives to grave risk in order to suit the convenience of their enemies. And that is precisely what the German submarine warfare against commerce means to the British merchant marine. Even though the submarine commanders tried to safeguard the lives of passengers and crew, they would frequently be unable to succeed. At best they would have to destroy the vessel and expose the passengers and crew to the sufferings and risks of reaching safety in unprotected and fragile boats. It would be as obnoxious to common sense to expect from merchant mariners submission to such treatment without resistance, as it would be to expect submarine commanders to encourage their own destruction by warning armed merchant vessels of an approaching visit.

Inasmuch as there is law and reason on both sides, what is the poor but perfect neutral to do? Every attempt to obey the law is open to the suspicion of being in some other respects illegal. Every attempt to be fair to one of the belligerents involves unfairness to its enemies. To insist that German submarine commanders shall obey the law of visit and search in case the captains of English merchant vessels are instructed to interpret their approach as a hostile act, is to insist upon an absurdity. To refuse permission to armed merchant vessels whose captains are instructed to fire on approaching submarines, to load cargoes at American ports, would be to discriminate against mariners who were merely acting on the fundamental human right of self-defense. They would be left unprotected against an enemy which is frequently disqualified by necessary limitations from safeguarding life in its destructive work. Whichever alternative the American Government adopts, its action will tend

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to bring about the one condition most repugnant to American interests and to those of peaceful commercial nations. The seas will become belligerent territory in which there is no law except the law of belligerent interest, and on which neutrals will lose all right and opportunity to travel in safety and to trade in peace.

Such being the facts of the case, the steering of an impeccably neutral course by this country is clearly impracticable. Americans are obliged to make up their minds not only as to the law but as to the merits of the controversy. The State Department can, of course, still provide for itself a flimsy legal shelter; but the shelter should only be used for temporary protection during the present war. Americans should be glad hereafter to escape from the confinement and timidity of a merely neutral position. As a consequence of the aggression of the belligerents and their own irresponsible timidity, they are being cramped for space. They cannot recover freedom of action without deciding to abandon the neutral path, to select or build a road of their own and travel on it. Their future security depends upon their ability to make up their minds what particular brand of unneutrality is best suited to their own national interests and the interests of other inoffensive democratic nations.

THE NEW REPUBLIC has already indicated how in its opinion the United States can reconcile reasonable national security and probable international justice with unneutrality. Its interests lie on the side of some kind of organized sea power, and organized sea power will be forced to outlaw the submarine for the same reason that organized military power is obliged to outlaw the guerilla. But if prevailing sea power intends to deprive the submarine of legal protection, it will have to do something to justify its increase of pretensions. It will have to reform itself. It cannot prevent submarines from being used as commerce destroyers without the coöperation of the United States and other neutral traders. The British Empire might as a consequence of superhuman exertions and sacrifices succeed in maintaining control of the surface of the ocean for an indefinite period, but such control will be vain in case deadly and ruthless enemies to its mercantile marine can roam almost at will beneath the surface. These enemies constitute a terrible menace to future British security. They can hardly in the long run be destroyed by naval force. They can only be ruled out by international agreement, backed by a threat of commercial non-intercourse, and in order to obtain such an agreement Great Britain will have to pay the necessary price. It will have to convert " navalism " from an instrument of national into an instrument of international policy.

Thus the advent of the submarine as a commerce destroyer, just because it threatens to bring about anarchy and terrorism on the high seas, can be used to transform the seas in war as well as peace into really international territory — the territory on which a system of international law has been defined and is enforced. As long as sea power can be legally used to serve the exclusive national ambitions of its possessor or to frustrate the legitimate national ambitions of a nation not possessing it, Great Britain cannot expect the coöperation of neutral nations in sustaining and extending the prevailing system of marine law; but such coöperation may well be obtained whenever Great Britain is willing to internationalize both the marine order and the power necessary to enforce it. And if such a system could be organized, the duty of the inoffensive neutral during war might be more costly than it now is, but it certainly would be less equivocal, humiliating and irresponsible. There would no longer be neutrals and belligerents on the high seas during war. There would only be rebels and the force of the international government. Sea power would become the weapon of international disapproval, acting according to predetermined rules similar to those now suggested by the League to Enforce Peace. The neutral nation would thereafter assume some of the cost of wars which might not involve any national interest; but it would be sufficiently compensated. Neutrality would no longer involve the danger of being either the victim or the parasite of the belligerent powers.

For Better Administration

PUBLIC spirited citizens are about to organize and to maintain in Washington an Institute for Government Research. Its chief object will be to perform for the federal government and administration a work similar to that performed by the Bureau of Municipal Research in New York City. It will study the vast business operations of the central government and the problem of organizing behind them a more efficient method of administration. The institute will be controlled by a Board of Trustees, consisting of twenty members, resident in different parts of the country, and distinguished either by the technical or the financial contributions which they have already made to the work of improving American administrative standards and methods. The voluntary contributions promised for its support will be liberal and will be pledged for a sufficient number of years to secure for the institute the services of the best administrative experts in the country.

The foundation of the new institute will do something to restore the courage and the hopes of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the band of American enthusiasts for good administration. Four years ago it looked as if everything was conspiring to promote a rapid, steady improvement of American administrative standards. Its friends were influential in the national government, and in many of the state and municipal governments. A strong tendency existed to impose new functions upon administration and to qualify it for performing increased and more exacting work by obtaining a better quality of administrators, by seeking to make administrative agencies more representative and more scientific in spirit and method. Those expectations have been falsified. The Taft Economy and Efficiency Commission was allowed to lapse, and nothing was done to use the enormous amount of valuable material collected by it. The new President was committed to a program which required him to subordinate the work of administrative improvement to partisan political needs. The standard of administrative appointment all over the country and particularly for the public service commission underwent a discouraging deterioration. The voters displayed on a number of occasions indifference and even hostility to desirable plans of administrative reorganization.

The formation of the new institute is probably the best step which could be taken at the present time to re-awaken interest in good administration. A national research bureau will have the opportunity of doing very much more effective work than a municipal or state bureau. The problems of administrative method considered by it will be of enormous intrinsic importance, because of the huge sums of money disbursed by the federal government. The report of the Taft Commission established in the organization of this government a culpable absence of the ordinary business safeguards against waste, and a scandalous duplication of work, confusion and conflict of function among different bureaus and departments. The institute will have a unique opportunity of bringing home to Congress and to the public the price which the country is paying for its indifference and hostility to administrative honesty and efficiency. Its critical analysis of the operations of the Washington Government, accompanied by specific suggestions for methodical improvement, will strengthen the hands of administrative reformers all over the country. They will be supplied with a vivid national object-lesson in the costs of inefficiency and of the need of reorganization, which is indispensable to an effective propaganda.

If the new institute lives up to its opportunities its work may have certain less obvious but even more important educational values. It may well develop into a school for the practical training of public servants. The studies which it will be making in the organization of the government and its method of operation will require the services of a number of investigators, which could be supplied in part by graduate students from the schools of political science in the universities. An arrangement of this kind would have a double advantage. It would add something of value to the existing methods of instruction in political science by associating it with realistic and stimulating field work, and it would train partially qualified young men to make the most of administrative positions. There is a crying need in this country for schools prepared to furnish precisely this kind of vocational training. Such schools should of course preferably be operated as departments of the public offices. The public administration should train its staff just as the National City Bank and other large private corporations are doing. But inasmuch as the prevailing standards of public administration make official training schools impossible at present, the best substitute is to associate vocational education for administrative work with institutes for government investigation. Thanks to the intelligent public spirit of Mrs. E. H. Harriman the New York Bureau of Municipal Research already has associated with it a school of this kind, whose successful work affords a clear proof of a lively demand for thorough training by young men who wish to enter the public service. A national school of the same kind associated with the national institute would of course have a considerably better chance of attracting such young men and of supplying them with practical training and attractive future opportunities of work.

In another respect, also, the development of the New York bureau will, we hope, be prophetic of the development of the national institute. In New York the work began, as it is proposed to begin in Washington, with a critical analysis of the existing operations of the government and with suggestions for improvement of method. This task occupied many years, and resulted to a considerable extent in the actual adoption by the municipality of the results of the bureau's investigations. But recently the New York bureau extended its work by submitting to the state Constitutional Convention a plan of state government, which was intended to promote administrative efficiency, and to provide at once for a more careful distinction between legislation and administration, and a more complete coöperation between these two branches of the government. A similar development will have to take place in the work of the national institute. In the beginning its energies will be devoted to its work of preliminary analysis, to the popularization of the results, and to the task of urging on the President and Congress specific reforms. But in the end it will be obliged, like the New York bureau, to work and agitate for good administration by exposing the constitutional

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and political obstacles to it. American administration is not inefficient merely because of the lack of cost-accounting systems and the duplication of bureaus. It is inefficient because partisan politics in Washington have always interfered with the independent discretion, the security of tenure, and the esprit de corps indispensable to obtaining the best work from administrative officials. A national Institute for Government Research will be obliged eventually, in the interest of its own proper task, to tackle these less technical and more contentious problems, and when that time arrives it should be able to do so with the authority which can only come from valuable practical achievement and from its ability to represent the disinterested political knowledge and thought of the community.

Commerce After the War

THE reactionary influence of war has throughout modern times made itself most manifest in foreign commercial policy. The wars of the French Revolutionary period utterly dissipated the liberal tendencies that, in the decade 1780 to 1790, were fast breaking down the old exclusive policy in matters of navigation and trade. The so-called "era of free trade," culminating in the 'sixties of the last century, received its first shock from the American Civil War, and was brought to an abrupt close by the Franco-German war. In a long period of peace, trade between the citizens of different nations assumes more and more the character of a private interest, to be regulated, in the exception, with a view to the national interest. In wartime the national interest in foreign trade assumes a superlative importance. The life of the British Empire and the prosperity of the Allied cause are manifestly bound up with the power of the Allied fleets to keep the channels of foreign trade unobstructed. If the Central Powers are less dependent upon foreign trade than seemed apparent at the outbreak of the war, they are none the less laboring under a severe handicap on account of their enforced self-sufficiency. And the possibility of bearing up under the burden of war debts and of restoring the antebellum prosperity of the general population is dependent, for the Central Powers as well as for the Allies, upon the reëstablishment of favorable foreign trading relations. The conclusion is irresistible that for a decade if not for a generation after the conclusion of the war much of the energy and ingenuity of European statesmen will be directed toward the creation of profitable relations. All the old weapons of commercial policy, such as tariffs, reciprocity treaties, export bounties and shipping subsidies will find extended employment, and new weapons invented in the course of the war will be tried out. What these new weapons are like it is worth while for us to consider. For if Europe has anything more effective than the old methods of regulating international trade, we are likely in the end to meet the necessity of developing similar methods for our own use if we wish to extend our foreign trade, or of creating counter-methods if we are desirous of controlling our own markets.

So far as the Central Powers are concerned, the recent contributions to the arsenal of commercial policy are few. The war, it would appear, has led to a remarkably effective organization of financial institutions. In trade and industry, credit has been made to operate successfully with the narrowest possible margin of specie reserve. Confidence in the adequacy of gold reserves has been replaced by confidence in the integrity and productive power of the nation. It is not probable that Germany will ever again find it necessary to hold such large investments in gold as heretofore for the mere purpose of insuring the stability of the national medium of exchange. Upon the advent of peace much of the existing hoard of gold will be available for founding financial institutions abroad, in regions where German trading interests can be advanced by financial power. This means that German trade will win independence from the London financial market, at the same time that the nation gains in competing power from the application to foreign trade of cash resources released by improved financial organization at home.

Another advance that Germany is making lies in the greater subordination of the Kartell, or industrial combination, to the purposes of national policy. By the traditional methods of commercial policy, privileges won from foreign nations through difficult negotiations have often proved illusory. We make concessions to Cuban sugar, in return for which we exact exceptionally favorable treatment for certain products of American agriculture and industry in the Cuban market. But in consequence of the fact that our market is a great one, while that of Cuba is small, the Cuban sugar producers secure materially higher prices for their sugar than they could possibly secure elsewhere, either at home or abroad, while our producers sell goods in Cuba at rates affording scarcely any more profit than might be secured if the goods were sold at home. And this is frequently the situation when exclusive reliance is placed upon the clumsy methods of the traditional commercial treaty. The German Kartell, subject to national regulation, is in a position to establish prices within any country, large or small, to afford the maximum of national advantage.

The Allies, too, have learned how to make a small gold capital support a vast volume of credit in domestic trade, and thus will be able to release

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much of their cash funds for the exploitation of new markets. They have introduced also a number of additional inventions. The most striking of these is the overseas trust. Just now it serves, in countries like Holland, Switzerland and the Scandinavian states, for the purpose of reducing the chaos of export and import business to an order susceptible of control in the military interest of the Allies. No irresponsible Dutchman or Swiss or Norwegian can import a pound of flour or cotton. The goods imported for the nationals of the lesser European neutrals must be used by those nationals, and not turn, directly or indirectly, to the advantage of the Central Powers. Now, what if the lesser neutrals become so familiar with ordered import and export trade, thrust upon them by British sea power, that they may decide to adopt the overseas trust as a permanent institution, to serve their own national purposes? This would be a method by which, in spite of liberal tariffs fixed by treaty, a nation could protect its domestic products against the dumping of masses of foreign goods greater than the market could absorb without demoralization. The overseas trust could conceivably be employed as a protective instrument by which a nation could at will make illusory any commercial concessions thrust upon it by a stronger nation.

Great Britain is also learning new methods of making commercial sea power tell against the trade of her rivals. As matters stand, the world's supply of bunker coal is largely in the control of Great Britain. There is no other country with coal depots so universal as those of Great Britain. If you wish to sail ships over all the seas—and you must if you engage in the business of ocean freighting—you will sooner or later be compelled to resort to British coal. This places with the British Government the power to impose conditions quite other than those of price. Thus according to a statement presented to both houses of Parliament in January, 1916, "Bunker coal is now only supplied to neutral vessels whose owners are willing to comply with certain conditions which ensure that no vessels owned, chartered or controlled by them trade with any port in an enemy country, or carry any cargo which proceeds from, or is destined for, an enemy country." The statement further recounts that several recalcitrant Swedish companies that had maintained regular lines to German Baltic ports as well as sending ships overseas, have been coerced into abandoning their German business. Here again we may raise the question: What if a method found efficient in time of war should be continued for purposes of commercial conquest in time of peace? Germany, and perhaps the United States also, would find serious obstacles to the development of a great ocean-carrying trade.

The major financial power of the world will still rest with England and France after the war, unless some great calamity, now unforeseeable, supervenes. It will be to England and France that the backward countries will turn for funds. Now the feasibility of making loans do service to exports was well established before the war. If German rails were laid upon a British or French concession, it was because the private interest in cheap construction was not subordinated to the national interest in exportation. How will the situation stand after the war? What is now taking place is a nationalization of capital. The British and French Governments are not likely soon to relinquish the plenary power they have assumed over flotations of capital, nor in the exercise of that power to overlook considerations of national interest.

These are all tendencies, say the surviving cosmopolitans, making for reciprocal injury among nations instead of for mutual gain. England can check Germany's recovery and Germany can check England's, but both will suffer. Without doubt. But until the peace of the world is established on firmer foundations than those of the past, the exchange of injury for injury in commerce will be counted a gain by the nation that suffers least, just as in war the exchange of lives for lives is a gain for the nation that loses least. A great war inevitably engenders trade jealousy as it engenders popular hatred, and of the two, trade jealousy is the more lasting. Petrograd and Berlin, Paris and London will engage for a generation in a mutually disadvantageous commercial struggle, because, according to the traditional diplomatic rules, it makes a great difference who dominates the shaggy mountain slopes and miasmic plains of the Balkans.

The Child Labor Bill

THE overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives in favor of the Keating Child Labor bill—337 against 46, with 48 not voting—is sufficient evidence of the trend of American opinion on the subject of the industrial exploitation of children. The only economic argument that is still advanced against the prohibition of factory employment for young children is that children thus employed are drawn from conditions even worse than those prevailing in the factory. This is an argument we have heard in the North from representatives of the canning interests and in the South from representatives of the cotton industry. It is an argument, however, that leads to quite other conclusions than industrial laissez-faire. If the children in New York tenements or on South Atlantic farms are actually in such des-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perate case that the cannery or factory represents material and moral progress, the authorities of New York and the South ought to proceed at once to organize a child rescue movement.

But the opponents of the child labor law are not resting their case with the argument from the relative beneficence of factory labor for children. They are taking their stand in the defense of the Constitution. Under the American system of government, they urge, the police regulation of industry falls in the province of the states. Federal control of interstate commerce was originally designed merely to make forever impossible the erection of artificial barriers to the movement of goods and persons over state lines. To employ the federal power over commerce as an instrument for regulating industry is to invade the proper domain of the state. By far the greater part of our domestic commerce is interstate—according to Mr. James A. Emery, at least 90 per cent of it. Consequently, if the federal government proceeds to regulate the conditions affecting the production of commodities entering into interstate commerce, it will in effect assume power over practically all industry. The states will be shorn of one of the most important functions that the Constitution-makers bestowed upon them. The prohibition of transporting products of child labor in interstate commerce will, it is urged, be followed by a similar prohibition of transporting the products of women's labor executed under conditions regarded by Congress as detrimental to health, and products of the labor of men inadequately safeguarded against conditions hostile to health or life, etc. Reformers will look to Washington instead of to the state capitols for the initiative in industrial regulation.

It is not necessary to linger over the merits of the strictly legal argument. It is certain that the opponents of the bill have very little hope that the courts would hold it unconstitutional. If they had such hope, they would hardly find it worth while to carry on a constitutional struggle in Congress. What concerns us immediately is the question whether such regulation as the bill embodies actually curtails, or rather supplements the power of the several states to regulate industry.

As everyone knows, one of the most serious obstacles to progress in labor legislation has been the failure of the states to work in coöperation. Almost every restriction imposed upon industry in the interest of the public welfare entails increased costs upon the producer. Children are employed in cotton mills only because their labor is cheap. Now, if one state raises the age of employment, it places its producers at a certain disadvantage as compared with those of other states less merciful to their children. It is a conceivable case that the legislator may be confronted with the alternatives of permitting child labor to continue, or of seeing the industries of his state fall behind those of states that do permit the exploitation of children. The competitive disadvantage of the state with enlightened labor laws is no doubt greatly exaggerated, but it is this exaggerated estimate of disadvantage that is in practice brought to bear upon the legislator. The fact is that no legislature feels free to regulate the industries of its state without taking into account the facts of interstate competition.

A federal law prohibiting the transportation in interstate commerce of the products of the labor of children under fourteen does not constrain any state to prohibit the employment of younger children in strictly local industries. It does free any state that wishes to fix its age of employment at fourteen from the danger that the products of unregulated child labor from another state will enter its market or common markets in competition with its more costly products. So far as such a measure as the Keating bill goes, it broadens the freedom of action of the more progressive states in the precise measure that it imposes the necessity of action upon the less progressive.

It is further to be borne in mind that federal regulation can at best fix minimum requirements only. Any state that seriously addresses itself to the elaboration of a scheme of industrial regulation will always find itself in advance of measures that can be enacted by a legislative body representing the whole country. It is therefore absurd to hold that such industrial regulation as Congress may impose can rob the state government of vitality. Only those state governments that are behind the times, devoid of vitality, will content themselves with minimum federal regulations instead of working out more severe regulations of their own.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1916, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY
PHILIP LITTELL
WALTER E. WEYL
WALTER LIPPMANN
FRANCIS HACKETT
CHARLOTTE RUDYARD
ALVIN S. JOHNSON

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER. ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eight-Hours for Railway Crews

AS an abstract proposition no one disputes the desirability of an eight-hour day for railway transportation employees. It is equally beyond controversy that the hours of work required of these classes of employees in certain branches of railroad service are excessive. The general basis of pay in freight service is theoretically ten hours, but in certain classes of traffic the average time actually on duty greatly exceeds this period. Employees in these branches of service have become the victims of what in railroad parlance is known as the "tonnage craze."

The development of heavier freight loads and larger freight earnings per mile has been the goal of all railway operating officials. Engines of greater and greater tractive power have been installed, freight cars of constantly increasing capacity have been built, the number of cars in trains has been increased, roadbed has been strengthened, heavier rails laid, new bridges constructed, grades reduced and curves eliminated—all for the purpose of getting heavier trains over the road with the object of reducing operating costs. The speed factor has been eliminated. In many instances it was found to be cheaper to load locomotives to the limit of their tractive power—to the point where they could only drag the trains over a division at a very low speed—than it was to send two trains of half the weight over the same division in half the time. Under this system of railroad administration the fact that the hours on duty of engine and train crews in certain branches of railroad service have become excessive is generally recognized and needs no elaborate statistical demonstration. The desirability of securing a shorter working day is not denied.

The real problem in the present movement for an eight-hour day is, therefore, a practical one. It constitutes a threefold question: (1) from a technical standpoint can the railroads be operated on an eight-hour basis; (2) if that is possible, in view of the fact that the employees are requesting an eight-hour day with the present rates of pay for ten hours, are the railroads financially able to comply with the request of the engine and train crews; and, (3) if the public approves of an eight-hour day for railroad transportation employees, and if its adoption by the railroads would add greatly to the financial burdens of the transportation industry, would this constitute a valid reason for expecting the public to authorize the carriers to advance their freight and passenger rates?

From a technical standpoint the eight-hour day is practical because it already is in successful operation on a considerable proportion of the railways in the United States. Locomotive engineers now have an eight-hour day in through freight service on 55 per cent, and firemen on 20 per cent of the railroad mileage of the South. In the territory west of the Mississippi River, about five per cent of the total miles of road operated have an eight-hour day for engineers and three per cent have the same working day for firemen.

Those roads which are now operated on a ten-hour day basis will not find it necessary to change existing terminals in order to establish an eight-hour day. It is acknowledged by the employees that it would be impracticable to compel railroads to change their division points so that they would be 100 miles apart. Special provision is made in the first article of their requests that so long as the mileage of an engine crew is equivalent to or exceeds 12½ miles an hour, there will be no increased compensation to employees for overtime. The railroads claim, however, that it would be necessary to reduce freight train loads in some branches of service in order to meet the speed requirements of 12½ miles an hour, and, as a result, operating expenses would increase and net earnings decline. This contention is one of the phases of the general argument of the carriers relative to their financial inability to meet the cost of establishing an eight-hour day, which may now be examined in detail.

In considering the cost of applying the eight-hour day on transportation systems where it is not already in operation, the significant point to bear in mind is that railroad transportation employees are, as a whole, pieceworkers. They are engaged in producing engine and train miles directly, and, indirectly, ton and passenger miles. The movement of so many tons of freight or so many passengers a distance of 100 miles is the standard day's requirement as to output. With this explanation in mind, it is obvious that if transportation employees can maintain their present output of 100 train or locomotive miles in eight hours, or less, as is now the case in passenger service, the transition from a ten-hour to an eight-hour day would cost the railroad nothing. The men would still contribute as much as they do now to the movement of traffic, and rates of pay would remain the same.

During the recent arbitration case between western railroads and their engineers and firemen, the railroads presented elaborate exhibits which showed that the average time of 78 per cent of through or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

irregular freight service on all railroads west of the Mississippi River in October, 1913, between terminals 112 miles apart, was 8 hours and 24 minutes. The transportation employees, therefore, in almost four-fifths of the through or irregular freight service in the West, which constituted about three-fifths of all freight train mileage, do produce their 100 miles, the standard for a day's pay, within 7 hours and 30 minutes. It would follow, according to these sworn statements of the railroads, that on slightly less than half of the freight traffic of the West the adoption of the eight-hour day would require no additional labor outlay. Additional outlay would probably be necessary for the adoption of an eight-hour day on only one-fifth of the through freight service in the West. No overtime at an advance of 50 per cent over regular rates, however, would be paid, as the traffic would probably be sent over the heavy divisions in lighter trains at a speed of 12½ miles an hour. Under any change in operating conditions which might occur, the increase in the total pay roll of the western railroads would be very small.

Approximately 70 per cent of the local freight traffic was handled in the West by engine and train crews which worked longer than eight hours each day. But local or way freight train mileage in the West constitutes only about 12 per cent of total train mileage, and as only 70 per cent of this would be below the speed of 12½ miles an hour, the adoption of an eight-hour day in this class of service would not add greatly to labor cost. In mixed and miscellaneous freight traffic and in pusher and helper services, and in work train service in the West, where hours are long among a large proportion of the employees, any increases in outlays for labor from the adoption of an eight-hour day would not be large, because they would be based on only five or six per cent of the total compensation to crews.

In the case of yardmen, switchmen and hostlers, who have a definite working day of ten hours or more, it would be necessary to reduce the working day arbitrarily, and the railroads would face a theoretical decrease of from ten to twenty per cent in hours of service. Manifestly, there would be no overtime penalty payments however, for work necessary beyond eight hours a day would be done by additional shifts.

In the East the proportion of freight trains which operate at a speed greater than ten miles an hour would be probably smaller, and in the South larger, than in the West. These illustrations from western operating experiences may be said, therefore, to be representative of operating conditions in the country as a whole, and would indicate that the financial aspects of the request for an eight-hour day need not cause serious apprehension.

The attitude of employees in requesting an eight-hour day is thoroughly consistent with their previous arguments for higher rates of pay. One of the fundamental claims advanced in the past for greater compensation has been that their output has constantly increased. To the extent to which the railroads may find it necessary to reduce train loads in order to maintain a speed of 12½ miles an hour, or an eight-hour day, it is now acknowledged that there may be a decline in train-mile earnings, and in the output of employees. There will be earnings remaining, however, arising from the increased work and productivity of transportation employees in the past, sufficient to compensate the railroads fully for any difference in labor costs. Although employees have in recent years received some wage advances they have by no means had a fair share in the revenue gains arising from their increased productivity. They have given to the railroads in increased work and productive efficiency, or in lower labor costs, more than they have received from the railroads. The movement for an eight-hour day is, therefore, a consistent request by transportation employees to share in past gains in productive efficiency for which they have not been remunerated—not so much to share in actual money as to gain in improved working conditions and general wellbeing.

The matter of increased passenger and freight rates, or the financial status of the railroads, is one which must be adjusted between the railroads and the public. If the public has required the railroads to make capital outlays for greater safety and service which are unproductive, and if the railroads can prove this to the Interstate Commerce Commission, they undoubtedly will be given authority to advance their rates. The public does not and will not expect railway employees to pay for these requirements by longer hours and more arduous service. On the other hand, it should not and will not be accepted by the public that, because of higher rates of wages, or by reason of a reduction in the working day, the railroads have in these facts alone a valid reason for asking for permission to advance their rates. The railroads must inform the public as to what disposition they have made in the past of the revenue gains which have arisen from labor efficiency and the ability of operating management.

As a matter of fact, the difficulties in which the railroads state they find themselves are not due to increased labor outlays but arise primarily from past methods in railway finance. The tendency has been for revenue gains to be absorbed by the interest and dividend requirements of fictitious stocks and bonds, or to be dissipated by improper or misguided financial management. There will be no permanent hope for the proper advancement of the economic well-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being of railway employees, no adequate protection to shippers, the general public and investors in railroad securities, until assurance can be obtained through the public regulation of railway security issues, and the general financial management of transportation companies, that the resources of the railroads will be used for the purpose for which they are required. If the railroads would frankly face a constructive legislative program along these lines their financial needs would undoubtedly be officially recognized, and public support for the much-needed rehabilitation of their credit and finances would be assured. The time has passed, however, when the public may be expected to accept the reasonable requests of railway labor as an explanation of the financial difficulties of the transportation industry.

W. Jett Lauck.

John Thorton—a Portrait

THE time-honored saying, "What man has done, man can do," has cheered and encouraged multitudes of patient workers toiling upward along the steep road to success. But among the mass there are a few whose motto might well read, "I will do what no man has yet accomplished." The character of these is always permeated with a special and unique power that bears them across the seemingly impassable barriers looming between them and their goal. Among these is John Thorton. He has not only achieved success, but in the achievement has wrought changes in the business world which will long remain as monuments to his peculiar talents, and as guideposts to aid and cheer future strugglers toiling up the path he trod before them.

John Thorton—like many other Americans who have risen to the top—started at the bottom. His earliest memory is that of arising with the sun and working unceasingly while it traversed its daily path across the heavens. When still a youth he was forced to give up his cherished hope for an education and devote himself to the sole task of earning a livelihood. His first position was in a little clothing store where he worked very hard for the sum of a dollar and a quarter a week.

Someone has defined a poet as a man who remembers his youth. If this be the correct definition John Thorton is a poet, for the memory of the privations endured in those early days has caused him to decree: "In The John Thorton Stores no one, not even a girl under legal age, shall receive less than ten dollars a month." John was, however, one of those precocious youths who cannot be kept at the bottom. Before a year had passed his services had been demanded, and secured, by a rival firm at an advance of twenty-five cents a week. For this he was very grateful; indeed, gratitude is one of his dominant characteristics. In his semi-annual addresses to his employees he urges that they always be thankfully satisfied with the conditions of circumstance. "This quality coupled with an earnest desire to give a little more in service than is demanded by the wage received will insure success." He says, "In all my years of mercantile experience I have yet to see one earnest worker who, if he gave more to his work than his employer demanded, did not at last reach some advanced position either on the office force or as floor-walker."

Although Thorton's poverty forced him to leave school with a limited education, he was always anxious to get more. This craving he satisfied by studying evenings after toiling behind the counter all day, and seizing with trembling hand each opportunity that opened the way to additional knowledge. In later years when asked by an admiring debtor how he secured such a marvelous understanding of human nature and literature, he answered, "I took it up as I went along, just as a locomotive takes up water from a track tank. All that I know to-day is the result of toiling after other men had gone to bed. Originally I was no brighter than others." His education is appreciated even in the scholarly atmosphere where he makes his home, and he is constantly called upon by the newspapers for his opinion of the future of the liberal arts, the American family, the duration of the war and our own army-and-navy question. College presidents and trustees do not neglect this fountain of knowledge. As he grows older and accumulates more money, he is often called upon to address the student body of the small colleges that are struggling against the competition offered by the larger universities.

In a sense his business career began shortly after the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861. Thorton, with the patriotic devotion that has always marked his life, bought a small clothing store from a man who sold cheaply because of his desire to enlist. The future merchant-prince at once offered his services to the federal government and made uniforms for the Northern soldiers. He was not ashamed to sweep out in the morning or to take down the shutters with his own hands, but his business grew by such leaps and bounds—due to his honesty and the fighting qualities of the Confederate soldiers—that this menial labor was not necessary after the first few months.

After the war the people did not forget his integrity nor his devotion to the Union in its hour of peril. His store continued to grow until the little shop down near the wharf developed into mammoth department stores in Cleveland, New York and Calcutta. Even in his rising success John Thorton

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never ceased the struggle for better goods and service, and the profits of his experience he gave to the public, for whom he had already done so much. Only once during his lifetime has he attempted anything else, and that was when, for his country's sake, he accepted the office of Secretary of War in the cabinet of President Smith.

Aside from his honesty and education, Thorton's greatest asset is his sense of humor. The head of the credit department of Rockwell and Jones, the great wholesale house that sells The John Thorton Stores a million dollars' worth of merchandise a year, once said in speaking of the great merchant, "He is the funniest man we have ever done business with." The story is told that often in the spirit of mere playfulness he will force a creditor to allow him the regular thirty-day discount, ninety and one hundred days after the bill was due.

From the time of his first excursion into retailing John Thorton has appreciated the value of advertising, and his originality and persistence along this line have always distinguished his business. Nor is this characteristic without its ethical importance, for it was the amount of his newspaper advertising that enabled him to suppress, in 1911, the printing of the Vice Commission reports. These would have undoubtedly been injurious to the reputation of his beloved city. The investigation was instituted and carried on without his knowledge, but was brought to his attention just in time for him to forbid its publication. For this public service he was elected president of the Public Welfare League, whose purpose is not only to suppress such investigations but to pass laws forbidding their passage through the mails.

Considering the great load under which Mr. Thorton has been struggling and the fact that he has not followed the beaten paths of trade but has always been a great innovator, it is not surprising to learn that he has more than once been on the edge of failure. But, like all great generals, he has refused to recognize defeat and has risen supreme over what appeared to be insurmountable difficulties. Once, just after he had completed his largest building, his clerks demanded higher wages, and he was forced to discharge them all and secure an entirely new force.

But the greatest side of this truly great American is his struggle for the welfare of others. Just as the War of the Rebellion brought out his love for the Union, so has his work along Christian lines brought out his love for humanity as a whole. The great Jewish evangelist, Frank Friday—whom Thorton had been instrumental in getting to his home city and to whom he had given, during the revival, the services of his limousine and country home—once said, "If we had more God-fearing citizens like this man, who worships the God of battles and believes in eternal damnation, we would not be forced to listen to the dogmatic theories of divinity-school professors." Surely we need go no farther to seek the perfect tribute to this wonderful man!

His life from the very start has been marked by Christian endeavor, and all through his business career he has urged his employees to join some Christian organization and spend their evenings either in self-improvement or listening to the lectures given in the Young Men's Christian Association or Young Women's Christian Association. To these organizations he has given, aside from his moral support, over a hundred thousand dollars. His greatest Christian work has been in his Sunday school, which he has worked for since he was a small boy. The writer saw the whole body of Sabbath-day scholars rise and greet him as one voice when he entered the auditorium, which he had given them some years before. The great man's eyes filled with tears as he answered, "Good afternoon, children." It was very touching. Later the author, from his seat in the back of the room, distinctly saw him place a ten dollar bill in the collection plate as it was passed to him on the platform.

Once when Prince William of Alluria was visiting this country he saw, during his inspection of the John Thorton Store in New York City, a certain unique tapestry that pleased him very much. The Prince, not being satisfied with the price, sent a representative to Mr. Thorton asking him to reduce the figure. The Master Merchant sent back word, "Tell your Prince of Alluria that in America—the land of democracy and equal rights—every article has the same price to all, whether prince or bondman." It is in these little personal touches that we see the man.

RICHARD DAVID BROOKE.

Negro Segregation in St. Louis

THOSE of us in St. Louis who like to believe that we stand for democracy, idealism and justice, who look back upon the history of the American people as one of noble achievement in pursuance of the ideal of liberty and freedom, are immeasurably shocked by the adoption of the segregation ordinance on February 29th. There are literally no redeeming features. The initiative, intended to protect the people against injustice and oppression, in almost its first use became the instrument of intolerance and prejudice. No other issues interfered with the judgment of the electorate. A special election removed all possibility that the result was in any way influenced by any consideration

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indirectly associated with segregation. The overwhelming majority by which it won sufficiently proves the condition of public sentiment in the fourth city of the United States. Not through a thin pretense of our supposed democracy and idealism was thrust this hideous figure of avarice, ignorance and prejudice.

No really adequate motive for segregation has been alleged. The depreciation of real-estate values by the moving of Negroes into white districts has certainly not been the cause of the depreciation of property in St. Louis, nor are the districts where Negroes live those in which values have depreciated most rapidly or most frequently. Indeed, the fashionable districts, the great boulevards, are those in which the decrease in property values has been most considerable and most rapid. No one can demonstrate an extent of racial opposition dangerous to the peace or happiness of either race in any district in St. Louis. No open discontent, no manifest breaches of the peace due to racial differences have occurred or have been alleged as the cause of an ordinance whose title proclaims this motive to be the reason for its existence.

The evidence is overwhelming that the Negroes have not sought as a body to invade the white districts, to live with white people, or to claim social equality. They have not attempted in objectionable ways to secure admission to public places of amusement nor have they been present in any noticeable number at recent public gatherings of any description. They themselves, with one accord, declare their present intention to live mostly apart from the white race as a matter of preference. They object to losing in the future their freedom to acquire property and to live where necessity or desire might dictate. The sole question raised was apparently financial. It affected a few landlords, a more considerable number of real-estate dealers and a few speculators.

Against it were arrayed those great forces which we have proudly assured ourselves and the world at large were the strongest factors in American life. Segregation is beyond all question undemocratic. It denies openly the legal and civil equality which we have been taught the Civil War was fought to assure the black man. It denies to a man that equality which Abraham Lincoln declared that the Declaration of Independence beyond all question claimed for all men whatever their previous condition of servitude, whatever their race or color. It is furthermore contrary to all those great tenets of morality, freedom, and justice which Christian ethics has upheld for centuries, to which the United States pledged itself publicly and advisedly some half century ago. These principles have been written into our laws and are a part of the Constitution of the United States and of the constitution of the state of Missouri, and upon them are based the majority of those precepts to which litigants in the courts commonly appeal.

Apparently there should have been no hesitation in the mind of the most depraved and un-American citizen, yet in twenty-six out of twenty-eight wards the majorities in favor of the ordinance were heavy, and the onus of shame must be borne by fashionable St. Louis as well as by the river wards, by the politicians of both parties, by native Americans, and by those of English, Irish, German, and Slavic blood. There is no evidence in the returns that native-born Americans were any more conscious of that heritage supposed to be American than were the most recent accessions to our population from Europe. Out of an electorate of one hundred and seventy thousand, less than twenty thousand were sufficiently interested to vote at the polls against the ordinance, and of these it is perhaps fair to assume that at least one-third came from the ten thousand Negro voters in the city.

Not the ordinance itself, but the state of public opinion which it unquestionably reveals, is the most discouraging result of the incident. It uncovers an extent, a depth, and a strength of race prejudice, of intolerance and base self-interest, such as we have preened ourselves could never exist in the land of the free and the home of the brave. Unquestionably the people of St. Louis are not what they have been taught to think they were. When the test has come between public and private interest, the latter won. When the Lusitania sank, an outburst of indignation apparently expressive of a love of humanity and justice was visible in the city of St. Louis. Beyond all question, those same individuals who on the one hand condemned and on the other justified that act went to the polls and sanctioned an act which is certainly inhuman, unjust, and unethical according to any standards which can be conceived.

The problems of democracy have given those most optimistic about its possibilities serious concern. The problem of the Negro is unquestionably one of the most serious that this country has to solve. One-half century ago the decision was made with the approval of the world, that the status of the Negro must be changed and his civil and legal equality assured him if his presence was ever to cease to be a menace to democracy itself. Only the Negro can save himself. Only an entire alteration in his condition can effect the desired change, but only with legal and civil freedom can the Negro hope to achieve anything, can this running sore in the American body be drained. The movement for segregation is gaining strength in the South and it has now won in a city where the Negro himself is scarcely more than an incident, and in no sense of the word

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a menace to the peace, happiness, or prosperity of the white man. If segregation is justified in St. Louis by conditions it is justified in nearly every part of the union, and if it is expedient in St. Louis it is a necessity in the South.

At the same time it means the perpetuation of the color line; the denial to the Negro of the most fundamental and important privileges which the war amendments were to guarantee him, the right to acquire and own property without restrictions and on the same terms as the white man. The specious flummery and idle technicality of this ordinance cannot conceal the fact that the privileges ostensibly denied the white man are not those he values. So far as the Negro has made progress in civilization he has made it uniformly as a result of contact with the white race. He came from Africa a mere savage and in the course of a century has made undeniable strides toward civilization, which have been far more considerable, by the testimony of all observers, since the acquisition of privilege than in the previous decades of slavery.

Segregation erects once more a slight, possibly a technical, barrier between the white and the black man. It is the principle rather than its practical application which is significant. The principle itself logically extends to the entire segregation of the black man from the white man, and would justify by the same arguments of expediency his relegation to a position of entire dependency and subordination. It is a step backward and not a step forward; it means retardation of the development of the Negro race, the perpetuation of the serious problem which it creates here.

At the same time, it should be said that the practical effects of the ordinance at present, should its constitutionality be upheld, are not likely to be as serious as its moral influence upon the white man and upon the Negro. It does not delimit a particular territory from which the Negroes may not move; it does not change their present residence; it does not propose to alter the complexion of mixed blocks in which the proportion of whites and colored is less than seventy-five per cent. Still less does it prevent expansion of the Negro territory. In effect, it will merely legalize and require the continuance of the existing segregation of the Negroes in three fairly considerable districts in the center of the city, and will practically insist that for some time to come the normal accretion of the Negro population should be taken care of by making the present blocks in that district, not already colored, black blocks. It is the educated and cultivated Negroes, those who will feel most keenly the stigma, those least deserving it, upon whom the ordinance will press most heavily.

Undoubtedly it will give real-estate owners of the present Negro districts some considerable hold upon them. It may enable them to raise rents and possibly certain speculation will follow in land values. But no careful framing of the practical provisions can disguise the undemocratic and unconstitutional character of the measure itself.

ROLAND G. USHER.

Miss Lowell and Things

EVER since Miss Amy Lowell explained the "new manner" in poetry I have been trying to imagine life lived as she describes it. For she says that there has been a changed attitude towards life which compels a poet to paint landscapes because they are beautiful and not because they suit his mood, to tell stories because they are interesting and not because they prove a thesis. I don't understand this "externality"; I don't know what it means to be interested in "things for themselves."

Let Miss Lowell try it some morning and see what happens. I pass over all the things that might catch her poetic attention between the first sound of the alarm clock and her appearance at the breakfast table. I assume that her human interest in breakfast carries her past them, and prevents her from lingering immeasurably over their color and form and polyphony. So she arrives at breakfast, and beholds a sliced orange. It fascinates her. She "never tires of finding colors in it," and sometimes the colors so occupy her that she takes them separately, unrelated to the sliced orange, as it were. She goes on gazing at "colors, and light and shade, in planes and cubes with practically no insistence on the substance which produces them." Says someone at the table, disconcerted: "Eat your orange, Miss Lowell." "Impossible," is the unhesitating reply. "I am interested in things for themselves. It is an inevitable change, my dear, reflecting the evolution of life."

My guess is that Miss Lowell does not live at this pitch of externality. I imagine that among the thousand objects which might attract her attention—oranges, eggs, umbrellas, dustheaps—she chooses some one about which to write a poem. And I imagine that she chooses it because it interests her for the particular mood she happens to be in. And I imagine that she feels she has written a good poem when her mood has got itself expressed about the object. I imagine she is external when it interests her to be external. To be sure, if she doesn't choose to be interested in her own feelings about the objects she selects, that is her affair. But she shouldn't ask us to believe that she has transcended them, and is now contemplating the world with the detachment of Aristotle's God. Nobody has ever yet succeeded

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in being external to himself, and I doubt whether Miss Lowell will succeed.

She speaks in her article about the universality of life, and then tells us that " noble thoughts " are anathema to the modern poet. Of course they are, if you put them in quotation marks. But there are noble thoughts which poets have not always ruled out of the universality of life, and those thoughts expressing the depth and variety of human desire are the elements which Miss Lowell's school somehow seems to avoid.

Much of their work often reminds me of the art collections which museums put in the basement—Persian pottery, a choice array of Egyptian beetles, six hundred and fifty specimens of Roman drinking cups, and a fascinating group of curious watches made at Nueremberg in the sixteenth century. All interesting enough if you have the time to look at them, and if properly distributed, amusing and delightful. A few specialists may be seen poring over the showcases, and an occasional party of tourists comes through bent on seeing all there is to see. But upstairs there is a crowd in front of the Madonna and Child, the famous Venus, and somebody's battle picture. Those are the art works the people remember, and hang photographs of in the parlor. It is the art with which they live.

And I wonder whether they're not more right than Miss Lowell, when they ask the artist to express human responses to the central issues of life and death. If art is a solace and a stimulus to men, are they such utter philistines in saying that the significant artist is not he who deals with things for themselves, but with things in relation to human need? I grant Miss Lowell that there are colors in the dustheaps, but what I'm afraid of is that her horror of noble thoughts has frightened her away from the effort to find color and significance in those more difficult objects about which human life revolves. I'm afraid that Miss Lowell calls a preoccupation with incidentals a brave attempt to be external and universal.

WALTER LIPPMANN.

The New Return to Nature

THE cry of the return to nature has heralded almost every movement in the history of painting. It means a great deal in one sense and very little in another. It does not mean, for instance, that the attitude about to be adopted is one that in the long run would commend itself as picturing faithfully the external world. In some cases it hardly aims at that, but what it always means is that a newer generation feels its older contemporaries to represent a tradition that is outworn, that has lost vitality, that is doomed. The meaning in the phrase " return to nature " is the awakening of creative energy, the reasserting of nature's endless procreative powers.

It seems at first extravagant to find evidence of a return to nature even in the works of our present inventors of strange fantasies; and in an obvious sense there is indeed none whatever. But in these matters one must probe a little deeper than the surface, and consider the currents of ideas in which these varied expressions are only eddies. Then it will be seen that in our time there are some special circumstances which make it different from the time that went before and explain the paradox.

The temper of the second half of the nineteenth century was naturalistic, determined by the immense development of science in that period. Romance seemed childish and capricious, and nothing but reality worth while. The painters of the time were sharers of the vision; Courbet, their leader, asserted hostility to anything that was not to be seen with mortal eyes or felt with fleshly hands. The so-called impressionists followed in a similar spirit, and sought in nature the truth of things and light and form and movement. Their later works show more of style, but style as quite distinctly conscious was added only later in the work of Seurat, Gauguin, and Van Gogh.

The inevitable reaction to the naturalistic nineteenth-century spirit followed, as the romantic reaction has followed the eighteenth-century commonsense. But there was a fundamental difference between the two; the romantic protest was in large part a revolt against the tyranny of law and an assertion of the value of caprice. The curiously insistent thing about the newest painting of our day is its aggressive logicality. It is as scientifically-minded as the painting that preceded it, but it is always thinking of the science that liberates the individual. It thinks of the geometries that prove the limited authority of Euclid. It delights in all the experiments of biological mechanics that prove the organism plastic, and feels a sympathy for the ultimate particles of matter. The older thought tended to look upon the world as made of atoms, whereas the current inclination is toward thinking of atoms making up a world. Creative evolution, the feeling that the spirit of man can work with elementary substance, is characteristic of it.

The older painters sought to master the nature

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of existing things, and to give expression to their proper laws of growth; the newer men have found that the laws of other things are incompatible with their own creative impulses. Trees were made to grow in the earth, and men to work and love and play. What has this to do with a flat rectangular canvas? They obviously do not fit together. On a flat canvas one can draw a line. That line gives birth to another, and so on. Or else we put a spot of color down, and then another spot which grows from that. The creative process has begun; there is the creator with his tools, and everything beyond that is irrelevant. Logic and law are words that constantly recur. Just as an oak is always an oak, though different with differences of soil and wind and weather, so forms of line and color are always forms of line and color, with differences of personal character, of tone or mood in the artist. Caprice is never found; there is nothing here but logic of form and personality.

This, I take it, is the meaning of the new return to nature. It goes far beyond the "returns" of former days in that it does not stop at the nature of animate and inanimate things, it does not stop short of the artist's own personality. He at last is free. Any more freedom would be suicidal, since that would free him of the very stuff to work with. Something must appear upon the canvas in order that there be a picture. Color and line are to this artist what atoms and molecules are to the creative impulse that builds up the world of matter; and he, the artist, is the central energy that brings to birth the sheer "aesthetic fact."

The sheer aesthetic fact has come to birth, but is it viable? The programs that announce it perhaps exceed in jubilant enthusiasm all programs ever known, and the proclaimed conditions are so removed from pettiness and the restrictions of crass material accidents that we might well be moved to greet with cheers the advent of an art which liberates the creative spirit from its ancient bonds. Why is it, then, that some of us who have watched it grow and given it sympathetic attention are soon bored to extinction by it, and why is it that many painters and amateurs who accepted it enthusiastically are giving it up because it leaves them feeling dry and empty? Indeed, it is true that most of those who have persisted do not attain to perfect abstraction. Picasso, for example, the archimage of the crew, is an Antaeus who needs an object to galvanize his impulse into action, and this object, to his imagination, remains actual throughout the metamorphoses that it undergoes. But even so he seems to find it necessary every couple of months to find some new device to keep his interest alive. At one moment he juggles analytico-synthetic arrangements of the nude, and at another scraps of newspaper; at one time everything is black and white, and at another polychrome spots appear; sometimes the object is quite recognizable, and at other times it is so lost to sight that he himself can afterwards not remember what it was. Occasionally he takes to bits of wood and tin and other odds-and-ends. The endless ingenuity of Picasso has done much to keep cubism fresh, but even so it stales most rapidly.

A well known text says that man was not born to live alone. But hear this from a recent exhibition manifest. "If my art is true to its purpose, then it should convey to me in graphic terms the feeling which I received in imaginative terms. That is as far as the form of my expression is involved. As to its content, it should satisfy my need of creating a record of an experience." This self-sufficiency is admirable, but is it really genuine? There was a time when art was said to be nature seen through a temperament, but now the only nature the artist recognizes is his own. There was an ancient theory of inspiration which held that the artist mediated between God and man; the modern artist seems content to mediate between God and himself. In former times he spoke a language common to himself and others, to-day he seems content to speak a language peculiarly his own. His "audience fit though few" he has now reduced to unity, and at last the artist and the public are as one.

Unhappily, the artist will not accept the logic of the situation. He wants an audience, he wants to have his personal reaction recognized and in a sense shared by others. In those cases where he has aspects of the outer thing taken up into his work, he seems to think that just so much of it as he may need should be just the right amount for others. But this is nonsense. The things he had in mind when he perceived the object are determinant of his choice. He gives us the choice without the hint of motive which to him makes the bits cohere. In obedience to the same kind of impulse which originally actuated him we seek the motive but cannot find it in one case out of fifty. The work remains a puzzle, and this explains in part why, in regard to modern painting, people are far more interested about it than in it.

There are of course some moderns who reject all partial representation and believe their language of line and color to be really the most universal language of form. It is true that everything we see is seen as line and color. None the less we are creatures of habit. From infancy we are accustomed to interpret these combinations in terms of our personal needs and of our social life. A pure arrangement of color spots may well be physically simpler than a human figure and yet be psychically more complex. The latter is for us a unit, a word full of rich meaning. Its very richness makes it less adaptable to free manipulation, but such speech as it lends itself to is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so ample that we can put up with its limitations. These modern painters would induce us to learn another tongue in order to get messages so inadequately put together and so empty that even their creators soon find them a dreadful bore. After all it is not only Picasso who is Antaeus. We all are of the breed, and on the whole we find it better to have our feet securely planted on the ground than to be precariously poised in the air or on one uncertain toe.

LEO D. STEIN.

Washington Notes

IT is a mistake, I think, to regard the votes in Congress on the submarine question as indicative of any radical change in American policy. Mr. Wilson eliminated the legislature from diplomacy; he asserted his control of the negotiations; he abolished, if you like to put it that way, democratic initiative in the conduct of foreign affairs; he smashed a rebellion. But the submarine question itself is still in a state of infinite confusion, and as one wise observer put it, "Confusion and doubt mean peace."

Ever since Congress assembled there has been a half-smothered rebellion against the President. The official leaders, Mr. Kern and Mr. Stone in the Senate, Mr. Kitchin and Mr. Champ Clark in the House, have not agreed with him on his foreign policy. There was a strong anti-preparedness faction among the Democrats. There is a much more considerable Champ Clark boom for President than is generally understood. Mr. Bryan's influence has been steadily against the President. Irish and German and Catholic influence have been anti-Wilson. He has made personal enemies of men who haven't gotten what they wanted from him, of men who felt that he should have confided in them. Behind these factional revolts lay the undoubted sense of the nation that there is nothing in the submarine controversy which would justify war.

All this began to seethe about two weeks ago. Prominent Democrats gave out interviews against the armed-ship policy, all of which were, of course, reported quickly to Berlin. Ambassador Gerard began to cable to the State Department saying that the Germans were inclined to flout the Administration on the ground that it couldn't carry the country with it. Mr. Wilson's letters to Senator Stone and Representative Pou followed. He knew that on a matter of foreign policy the President can always master Congress, and he determined to kill the revolt.

To understand what followed it is necessary to remember the rules of the Senate. When Mr. Wilson demanded a vote, Senator Stone, the natural man to bring it up, was against him. So seven or eight Senators who were friends of the Administration formed themselves into an unofficial steering committee. Their problem was to get some kind of a vote as quickly as possible for the President. But under the Senate rules there is only one motion about which there can be no debate, and that is a motion to table. Had they asked for a vote on the Gore resolution itself, the Senate might easily have debated the question for weeks. For the Senate is organized in such a way that a vote can always be delayed but never expedited. The Wilson Senators saw that they must have a vote immediately, knowing perfectly well that they wouldn't stop the speech making, but if they got anything that could be called a Wilson vote, they had won.

They were forced to choose the motion to table. They selected Senator Ollie James to make it, and out of courtesy to Senator Stone they allowed him to bring the Gore resolution before the Senate. It was arranged with the Vice-President before the Senate met that Mr. James should be recognized as soon as the resolution was brought out of committee by Mr. Stone. With everything prepared, the Administration forces were ready to table, no matter what the resolution said. That is why the fact that Mr. Gore reversed the sense of it made no difference to them. Indeed, one of them told me that he didn't find out till afterwards what the resolution was which he had voted to table. And he didn't care. The vote had one intention only: to give Mr. Wilson a free hand.

The situation had one quality which the Senate loves. It accomplished a purpose without committing anybody to anything. It was all things to all men. Between an aye vote and a nay vote there is no difference so far as submarine policy goes. Mr. Lodge and Mr. Gore both voted aye, Mr. Borah and Mr. La Follette both voted nay. Each Senator is in a position to say that his vote meant whatever it is most comfortable to have it mean. The Democrats and the Republicans both avoided the fatal split and everybody won a victory.

In the House it was easier to force a vote. For while the Senate is organized to permit debate, the House is organized to avoid it. But as in the Senate, the vote on the McLemore resolution represents no conviction on submarine policy. It is possible to interpret a vote either way as the voter pleases. The most that can be said for those who voted to table is that they voted to give the President a chance to negotiate without interference. It is still asserted that the House is against a forceful policy about armed ships. It is also asserted that the House will support the President no matter what his policy is. There is not in the American Congress any such thing as legislative control of diplomacy. The axiom that politics stops at the water's edge would in a crisis obliterate the real conviction of the House or Senate.

Now that Congress has eliminated itself, what of the international situation? No one knows. There is no fixed policy. That the Administration will not yield in principle is certain, but what it will do in a specific case no one, I think, can tell. All the concepts involved—What is an armed ship? What is offensive action?—are capable of so much interpretation that no clean-cut issue exists. My guess would be that Mr. Wilson's intention is to keep the general principle alive during the war, avoiding if possible a break over any particular case. He will not act in the dark, yet each instance is likely to be shrouded in darkness. Unless the Germans lose their heads completely, the cases which arise are almost certain to be like those of the Arabic and Persia, too confused for any action on our part. There will be "crises," investigation, discussion. But even the dismissal of Bernstorff is not to take place, I am told, unless the issue is so clear that the President can consult Congress

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about it. Senators understand that Mr. Wilson will not break off diplomatic relations until he has secured their approval.

So far as I can make out, the determining factors to-day are what they have always been: the nation's desire for peace, Mr. Wilson's recognition of that desire mixed with the intention to save general principles rather than to act on specific cases. The Democrats believe that the country will call Mr. Wilson's diplomacy successful if he yields no abstract right and avoids a break with Germany.

There is no feeling in Washington that war impends. No one is hurrying about the military measures, and the appointment of Mr. Newton Baker can hardly be regarded as a belligerent act. Mr. Wilson has not summoned a Kitchener to head the armed forces of the United States.

Washington, D. C. W. L.

CORRESPONDENCE

Child Labor Under the Constitution

SIR: Returning to my desk, I find upon it two interesting communications from THE NEW REPUBLIC. One is a note from its treasurer urging the renewal of any subscription, telling me that it means more to you "than the money involved," as it is evidence of my desire for a journal of opinion at a time "when perhaps as never before, clear thinking and the facing of facts are essential." With this note came your issue of February 5th, in which, under the complimentary title of "Devil's Advocates," I find a number of selected extracts from the testimony of southern manufacturers made at a committee hearing in opposition to the so-called "Keating Child Labor bill," and that "in this crew and supporting it was to be found Mr. James A. Emery, Counsel for the National Association of Manufacturers."

There seems to be a curious lack of coördination between the financial and editorial management of THE NEW REPUBLIC. One objects to my company—the other desires it. One represents you as a journal of clear-thinking and a facer of facts—the other presents you as neither presenting the facts nor comprehending them, much less thinking about them.

Assuming for a moment that the handful of disjointed, hand-picked selections from three hundred pages of a hearing justified the defamation of southern manufacturers, it is a curiosity of reasoning by which you make me responsible for their statements because, for a different reason, I object to the legislation. Since when was it "clear thinking" to hold all who, for different reasons, opposed or approved a proposal responsible for the views or expressions of each? The New York *Call* approves the appointment of Mr. Brandeis because, it says, "he will soak the employers." THE NEW REPUBLIC has approved him in an able article. Is it therefore "in this crew and supporting it"?

However, I am little concerned with the detail of your dialectics but surprised and disappointed that a publication "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought" will discuss an important piece of legislation without describing what it is, misrepresent the position of a great association of manufacturers with regard to it, and insinuate that they neither know why they oppose the measure nor have had opportunity to express themselves with regard to it.

Will you for a moment "face the facts" rather than the gratuitous misinformation of the anonymous sciolist who presumes to condemn manufacturers for taking a position which he either did not examine or did not care to recognize?

In the article on "Brandeis," in the same issue, you say editorially:

> "At present the important field of judicial interpretation is practically restricted to two provisions of the Constitution: The commerce clause and the 14th Amendment. Around these center the contending forces of state and national action."

The Keating bill is regarded by manufacturers as a revolutionary extension of the commerce clause. Save in details, it is not a new proposal. Its essence is found in the provision which makes it unlawful for any producer, manufacturer or dealer to ship or offer for shipment in interstate commerce a commodity produced in whole or part by the labor of a child below a certain age. Senator Beveridge, in 1907, first proposed this principle, but made it unlawful for a carrier to receive the shipment, not for the manufacturer to offer it. Among the two and a half million employees of the National Association of Manufacturers are very few children in mechanical departments who would be affected by this measure. But there is not a single manufacturer who may not be gravely affected by the recognition of the principle of control involved. This, and this alone, was the reason which caused the National Association to oppose this proposal in 1907-8, when the Association first discussed and condemned the principle in its national convention. Upon the renewal of that proposal in another form, the twenty-two directors of the Association, from as many states in the union, after receiving communications and inquiries from many members over a long period of time, renewed their condemnation of the endeavor to urge Congress to control domestic manufacture within the states under the guise of regulating commerce.

In opening the argument before the Congressional committee, you will find that I stated on page 157 of the hearings:

> "The National Association of Manufacturers has been at no time opposed to the regulation of child labor. It has never appeared in any state, so far as I know, in opposition to or criticism of the rational regulation of child labor. . . .
>
> "I represent the opposition of manufacturers in this country to the principle of control here invoked, because it seems from an examination of the measure that it proposes to substitute an exercise of police power by Congress for that of the legislatures of the respective states themselves. Nay, more, by the circumstances of interstate commerce in this country it substitutes the views of Congress for those of boards of aldermen and supervisors and county or municipal authorities in the states themselves with respect to the subject matter here involved, and, more than that, creates a precedent permitting 'many an error by the same example to creep into the state.'"

I know it is easy to sneer at the motives of manufacturers in taking such a position as a matter of principle, and to ac-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cuse them of concealing their real attitude toward the child in industry by an appeal to the Constitution, but I know equally well that the most prominent members of the Association have coöperated in every state in all rational movements for the regulation of child labor. The Association has been a leader in the greatest bit of industrial humanitarianism in our day—accident prevention and compensation. It was referred to by name in the Majority Report of the recent Federal Commission on Industrial Relations, when they spoke of "three great private associations" that "have sprung up which are doing as much or more for safety than all the state and federal governments combined." It is easy to abandon a principle and be popular—it takes courage to hold to it when its defense makes misrepresentation of your motives the easy task of the malicious and the unfair.

However, the Association has been in good company. A larceny of local self-government, under the cloak of protecting the child, has excited the fears and condemnation of ex-President Taft, of former Attorney General Knox, and of nearly every recognized modern commentator upon the Constitution who has discussed this extension of the commerce power. The issue was squarely presented to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives in 1907, when the House asked its law committee to advise it whether or not, under the commerce power, it could regulate female and child labor, and irrespective of party the Judiciary Committee unanimously replied:

> "It it not a debatable question. It would be a reflection upon the intelligence of Congress to so legislate."

The Supreme Court has repeatedly pointed out that "commerce begins where manufacture ends." Mr. Justice Lamar, in a famous decision (Kidd v. Pearson, 128 U. S., 1) discussed the results which would follow the acceptance of the principle of control asserted in the Keating bill, and said:

> "The result would be that Congress would be invested, to the exclusion of the states, with the power to regulate, not only manufacturers, but also agriculture, horticulture, stock raising, domestic fisheries, mining—in short, every branch of human industry. . . . A situation more paralyzing to the state governments, and more provocative of conflicts between the general government and the states, and less likely to have been what the framers of the Constitution intended, it would be difficult to imagine."

It is with "this crew" that the National Association of Manufacturers and its counsel have been keeping constitutional company. It is over a period of nine years that they have considered and rejected the principle proposed in the pending measure, and it is for the reasons that I have suggested that they have taken this position, with the full realization that the penalty of their devotion to a fundamental principle upon which rests the very integrity of this government would be misconception and misrepresentation of their motive and action; but they look for such misapprehension and misstatement, not to critics priding themselves upon intelligence and fairness, like THE NEW REPUBLIC, but to those who make it their deliberate business to generate suspicion of employers. If THE NEW REPUBLIC is found in this company, to quote the writer of the article to which I have objected, how shall they "expect the rest of us to respect its opinion?"

Personally, I should think your intelligent readers would form a just estimate of your character as a journal of opinion from the fact that you will or will not permit the appearance in your columns of an endeavor to present, through such means as this, the viewpoint of those whom you criticize, whether you agree with it or not.

JAMES A. EMERY.

Washington, D. C.

[NOTE.—The motives of Mr. Emery, and of those members of the National Association of Manufacturers who support his opposition to the Keating Child Labor bill, may be entirely pure and disinterested. In effect, however, they are aligning themselves with the representatives of southern industrial feudalism who have steadfastly and successfully resisted state legislation aimed at the suppression of child labor, and who are now as vigorously opposing any national remedy for what has become a national industrial menace. It was in this sense that we referred to Mr. Emery as being "in this crew." It is not surprising that he feels uncomfortable in such company.

Mr. Emery's constitutional arguments we believe to be as unwholesome as the company in which he appeared. It may be conceded that if a state sees fit to allow the vitality of its future citizens to be undermined, the federal government has no power to coerce it into action. The Keating bill has no such object. But the child-exploiting industries to which the bill applies produce not for the state alone, but for the whole country. The very life of these industries depends on the use of those facilities of interstate commerce which have bound the United States into a nation. Over those facilities Congress has complete control. Can it be argued that Congress has not the power to withdraw the use of those facilities from an industry which threatens the health and stamina of American citizens? Is it a "larceny of local self-government" to decline to make our national transportation system a party to a traffic which alone makes this assault on our national standard of living possible? It is significant that the dictum of the Supreme Court, from which Mr. Emery deduces that Congress is powerless, was uttered more than thirty years ago, when the modern conception of the commerce clause as an instrument of national control over national industries was as yet in its infancy. Since then the Supreme Court has decided that Congress can withdraw the facilities of interstate commerce from the traffic in lottery tickets, in obscene literature, in uninspected meats, in misbranded drugs, in women transported for immoral purposes. That these laws deal with a situation which had hitherto been left to the police power of the states is recognized to be no objection. Only last January Mr. Justice Hughes, speaking for the Supreme Court, summed up the effect of these decisions to be that "Congress is not to be denied the exercise of its constitutional authority over interstate commerce, and its power to adopt not only means necessary but convenient to its exercise, because these means may have the quality of police regulations." (Seven Cases v. United States, Jan. 10, 1916.)

There is another aspect of the Keating bill which Mr. Emery overlooks. Manufacturers in states which have adopted an enlightened and advanced program of labor legislation complain constantly that they are placed at a serious disadvantage in competing with manufacturers in states which permit the employment of cheap child labor. A state legislature may well hesitate to impose a higher expense on its manufacturers, when an adjoining and less enlightened state can flood it with the cheaper product of child exploitation. Under our dual form of government the state is powerless to prevent this. For a state to forbid the importation of goods made by child labor in another state would be unconstitutional, as a direct interference

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with interstate commerce. It would be a serious flaw in our constitutional structure if this power, withdrawn from the states, were also denied the federal government. The argument that Congress has not the power to protect national industries from the unfair competition of child-exploiting states comes with peculiarly bad grace from those manufacturing industries who have so vehemently demanded from Congress protection against the products of under-paid European industries.—THE EDITORS].

What is Prussianism?

SIR: What do you mean by "Prussianism"? On page 102 in your issue of February 26th, the destruction of Prussianism means the destruction of effective German national organization. On page 104, 4,000,000 resolute opponents of Prussianism are going to save Germany.

DORIS WEBB.

Brooklyn, New York.

To Destroy Prussianism

SIR: I am deeply interested in your reply to Mr. Santayana's letter. I had not regarded you as pro-German, but being rather strongly anti-Prussian I disagreed with your wish for an "inconclusive peace" because such a peace seems to me to be much more certain to be a "writing of plans for future war" than even the oppressive peace which you most fear. Are you not sustaining your position by too strong speech when you say that destroying Prussianism "can only mean the destruction of effective German national organization"? Prussianism is a term which progressive Germans have themselves used to express the archaic militaristic spirit and organization which has so long burdened the nation and has finally plunged it into this terrible conflict, and, as you with evident contradiction recognize later on, the Social Democrats had before the war polled 4,000,000 votes against this spirit and organization. Were the Social Democrats working for the "destruction of effective German national organization"? Were they not fighting the oligarchy that was forcing upon the German people, including the people of Prussia, this despotic tradition of absolute power and partnership with God that has ever made the Hohenzollerns place family ambition and family quarrels above the happiness of the German people? Therefore, would not a peace that would destroy this system—which it seems to me absurd to compare with the destruction of the wonderful national organization of the German people—actually lead to the goal that you and I at least seem to have in mind, i.e., a genuine parliamentary control of Germany by the German people? The breaking up of Russia is vastly to be desired, but it does not seem moral or practical to bribe Germany by an inconclusive peace to accomplish this, and most decidedly dangerous to deliver into the hands of the present Prussian oligarchy control of the Balkans, Constantinople and Asia Minor. Your argument seems to be based upon your hopes and not upon the terrible facts, and it does not consider the justice of German control over the Balkan peoples. Prussia has been as grasping and oppressive towards Poland and Austria, towards the Slavs of the Balkans, as Russia has been towards the Poles and the Finns. Again, is not the break-up of the Russian autocracy after the war even more certain than the conquest of Prussianism by the continued growth of the Social Democrats? If we consult our hopes alone we may see Finland and the Ukraine free and independent of Russia, Poland united and independent of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, Rumania united and independent of Russia and Austria or Hungary, but if the war leaves the Hohenzollerns in the saddle is there any prospect that our hopes will be realized? To say nothing of continued Turkish control of Armenia.

MARCH G. BENNETT.

Boston, Massachusetts.

[NOTE: Prussianism means to THE NEW REPUBLIC exactly what it means to Mr. Bennett and to the Social Democrats in Germany—an oligarchic and militaristic attitude associated with the present dynasty, which is not essential to German national organization. Yet it can be made so by pressure from without. As such it is a problem for the Germans themselves to solve; and one which we believe they would be in a better mood to solve after an inconclusive peace than after an abject defeat, reinforced by foreign interference. If the Allies believe that they themselves can crush Prussianism by war, they must mean by Prussianism the whole national organization of Germany, for that is the only thing they can destroy by war. The Allies are fighting not Prussia alone, but Germany, and they cannot reach in and regulate German internal affairs—unless they should first destroy the German national organization and reduce Germany to a vassal state. Do our correspondents believe this to be possible? If so, do they see any advantage in the substitution in Germany of a foreign oppression for a native one?—THE EDITORS.]

Mr. Pier Relieves His Mind

SIR: From your reply in the issue of February 26th to Mr. Santayana's pointed question I would select one paragraph as the most stupid and ignorant piece of writing that has come to my notice since the outbreak of the war. It is that on page 103 beginning: "Any misgivings we may have entertained about the cause of the Allies have always turned upon the contribution that Russia has made to the Alliance." Consider the series of ineptitudes that follow. You have "never felt any obligation to prefer the Russian to the German case." Then you have not taken the pains to inform yourselves of the untiring efforts that M. Sazonov made to avert the calamity of war, or of the implacable determination of Austria, supported by Germany, to precipitate it. Refresh and enlighten your minds by referring to the diplomatic exchanges that took place in the capitals of Europe in July, 1914. "If one is obliged to choose between Russian and German domination in the Balkans, we would prefer the German. At least the Germans bring with them science, good administration, social order, and economic development." In short, Kultur. The economic development of Belgium under German administration has been a marvel of efficiency. "The Germans are the most honest, the most capable, the most enlightened administrators in the world." No, it is not from *The Fatherland* that I am quoting; it is from THE NEW REPUBLIC. "To establish the oppressors of the Poles and Finns as the dominant power in the Balkans . . . would leave the friends of France and Great Britain an ugly cause to plead at the bar of history." How noble by contrast the cause that the sapient editors of THE NEW REPUBLIC are already eagerly pleading—the establishment of the scientific, honest, efficient administrators of Belgium as the dominant power in the Balkans!

I have read THE NEW REPUBLIC from its first issue,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, misled by the promise of its infancy, have recommended it to many of my friends. I shall do so no longer. Your tepid sympathy with right, your forbearing tolerance for monstrous wrong, your lackadaisical other-mindedness in relation to a conflict between passionate devotion to ideals of liberty and maniacal assertion of autocratic power, are nauseating.

ARTHUR STANWOOD PIER.

Hyde Park, Massachusetts.

The Arizona Strike

SIR: Anyone who has any knowledge of the Clifton-Morenci strike in this state must experience a shock when he reads the editorial on that subject appearing in your issue of January 24th. It is really surprising that your columns should be so readily accessible to those who desire to spread misinformatian and unfair statement.

It may be assumed that the editorial department of THE NEW REPUBLIC would not intentionally give publicity to a misrepresentation of facts or conditions of any industrial conflict, but the material of the editorial referred to so plainly emanates from a partisan source that an investigation of the verity of the statements might well have been made and verdict suspended until the defendants had their day in court.

To state the facts in detail would take too much time and space, and would probably be futile. They are readily accessible and leave no room for legitimate dispute. Also, the fact of my official connection with one of the mining companies involved in the strike, to anyone adept in modern civic or quasi-political discussion, affords a satisfactory answer to anything I might say.

Let me point out, however, that the Morenci strike, when compared with the Colorado strike to which you refer with assured familiarity—and assuming but not conceding that your notions of the Colorado strike are correct—presents an interesting and instructive contrast. In Colorado, as you view it, all of the forces of law and the power of the executive were on the side of the employer and against the strikers. In Arizona they were all arrayed on the side of the strikers and against the employers. In Colorado, as you view it, the rights of innocent citizens and residents were trampled under the feet of the employers. In Arizona they went under the feet of the strikers. If Colorado was as bad as you say it was, the two strikes present opposite extremes which may well make the average citizen yearn for some method whereby the forces of law and order may preserve an even balance between the contending parties.

In Arizona there was no occasion for the governor to prevent or discourage the importation of "armed guards, thugs, gunmen, detective agencies or strike-breakers" because the companies made no attempt to import any such. On the contrary, they announced at the outset that they would not do so, and consistently adhered to that announcement.

An organizer of the Western Federation of Miners unionized the camps and called the strike. Without presenting to the companies any demands or grievances, they closed down the mines and smelters and then sought to confer. Immediately the companies handed over their plants and properties to the sheriff. They made no attempt to hire armed guards or to save their properties from waste or deterioration. They paid such guards as the sheriff employed, and I believe it may fairly be said that the selection of guards was made to the satisfaction of the strikers, and that the principal financial support of the strike was afforded by the moneys so disbursed by the companies.

You mention "strike-breakers" as being concentrated nearby. Doubtless you refer to former employees of the companies and their families, who were furnished free board and lodging in a tent colony established and maintained by the companies at their sole expense, as a means of mitigating the burdens which commonly fall upon the innocent and guilty alike as a result of a labor strike. This colony wholly consisted of hundreds of workmen who refused to join the union, were not in sympathy with the strike and were forced to leave the strike district because they could not safely remain there. If you were interested, you might have access to upwards of one hundred affidavits made by such persons and revealing a condition of affairs in the strike district, which, except for the example in Colorado as seen by you, would be quite inconceivable to an average American, unless the narrative purported to refer to conditions in Mexico or some other such unfortunate land where the lamp of liberty has not shone.

At this tent colony any former employee whose work failed because of the strike was made welcome, whether union or non-union, whether he supported the strike or not; and I believe all who there partook of the companies' hospitality will agree that it sufficiently answered any suggestions that they were trying to starve the strikers into a surrender.

The strikers took complete charge in the strike district. Crowds of strikers, unopposed by the authorities, stoned and broke windows of mining-company offices. Within a short time one of the large concentrating mills, in the protecting custody of the sheriff's office, was destroyed by fire. The strikers issued and enforced their orders as to who might enter, remain in or leave the district. They ordered many residents to leave their homes and property in the district, not confining their attentions to persons who were directly or indirectly connected with the strike or with the companies, and their orders were obeyed. Law-abiding citizens were cited to appear before the strikers' committee and hear their judgments, which, be it said, were enforced with entire effectiveness. Those who appealed to the civil authorities for protection did so in vain. Many were obliged to flee at night and hide in the mountains. Many were brutally assaulted and beaten. A wholly innocent and inoffensive Catholic priest was forced to leave his home and parish in obedience to the order of the strikers. A visitor in the district, wholly a stranger to the strike, and a non-resident of Arizona, was set upon in the public streets and seriously beaten by a mob, suffering broken ribs and other injuries. Those who complained to the governor were courteously advised to tell their troubles to the sheriff. Those who appealed to the sheriff either were taken in custody "for their protection" or were furnished with written passes requesting that the bearer be not molested for a stated period at the expiration of which he promised to leave the district.

The managers of the three companies, being advised that their presence was likely to provoke riot and bloodshed, departed from the district by a night train. The crew in charge of this train upon returning to the district were brutally assaulted and mistreated by the strikers, receiving no protection from the sheriff's office. When the managers arrived in New Mexico, they were arrested on a warrant from Arizona, charging them with inciting a riot by leaving the state, but were released by an unusually sapient justice of the peace and proceeded to El Paso where they remained until the strike was over. No attempt was made

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to resume operations, although such an attempt would have been legally and morally defensible, and although the price of copper proceeded in its upward flight.

The companies made every effort to avoid suffering and bloodshed, and up to date cannot fairly be charged with any. They spent large sums in feeding and caring for their old employees and their families who were thrown out of work by the strike, and would have been destitute otherwise. They did not ask the courts to help them resume operations through injunctive process. It is true that some of the state militia were sent by Governor Hunt to the district, but their mission was not to preserve law and order or to protect the rights of citizens. They were sent there to prevent the importation of strike-breakers; that is, to prevent the residents of the tent colony from returning once more to their homes and former employments in the district.

Conditions in the strike district finally became such that a large number of wholly disinterested citizens organized a species of vigilance committee, which undertook to protect law-abiding citizens from oppression by the strikers. Thereafter, when the strikers' committee ordered a man to leave the district, this vigilance committee made an issue of it and of course prevailed. The man remained. An Arizona vigilance committee commands instant attention and respect.

Largely as a result of the formation of this committee and of its activities, conditions in the district improved rapidly, but you will note that such result is not to be credited to our governor, or to the sheriff. The peace which had theretofore prevailed under their beneficent influence, and which elicits your warm approval, was merely that sort of peace which resulted from the unopposed and absolute domination of the district by the strikers; the peace of uncontrolled and unopposed violence and oppression.

I note that you view it as unfortunate that the Western Federation of Miners, considering the strike as improperly called, did not give it proper support; also, that the American Federation of Labor failed to give the help it should have given. Without knowing the why or wherefore of such derelictions, one might naturally infer that those organizations did not act hastily or inadvisedly in the matter, and that perhaps the strike was not wholly justified. It is commonly reported that despite the alleged technical irregularity of the strike, the former organization collected upwards of twenty thousand dollars in dues from the strikers, out of which it returned slightly in excess of one thousand dollars to help support the strike. Also, it may now be stated that the strikers have unanimously voted to surrender their Western Federation charters and return to work upon the companies' terms, being assured that when operations are resumed the companies will hear and consider any grievances or complaints which their employees may present.

You refer to plate matter as having been published by the companies in Arizona newspapers, and to an attempt to recall Governor Hunt. The matter referred to consisted almost wholly of the affidavits above mentioned, the truth of which has not been questioned, except by the charge that they were published at the behest of the companies and that all of the forty-odd guilty newspapers were owned or controlled by the governor's enemies.

Undoubtedly such publications did tend to embarrass the governor and the sheriff. The press also commented to some extent on the action of officers of the state militia, in the pay of the state, and stationed in the strike district ostensibly to preserve law and order, in drilling the strikers in military formation and tactics. While the strike was in progress a recall petition was initiated in Maricopa County, an agricultural district, remote from the strike zone, by prominent and influential citizens who complained that their taxes had increased too rapidly under Governor Hunt's administration, and also charged the administration with inefficiency in various directions. Naturally, the governor and his friends filled the air with charges that a "hierarchy of special interests" was on his trail because of his firm and impartial treatment of the strike situation, and because he had nobly refused to order the militia to shoot down helpless women and children in the streets of Clifton and Morenci.

Anyone who knows anything about it appreciates the absurdity of such charges and knows that they have not a vestige of foundation in fact, but they are of a character which immediately produces conviction in minds naturally indisposed to ask for proofs or to investigate the merits. Backed by the support of your columns such charges should travel far on their own feet.

Your editorial on this subject leaves one with a strengthened conviction that the difficult relations between capital and labor deserve temperate, fair and discriminating consideration, and that inflammatory invective from the contenders, or half-baked philosophy from the high-brows, merely tends to increase the difficulties. This Arizona strike has been noteworthy, probably without full precedent in strike history. The course pursued by the companies was distinctly unusual. It would seem that even selfish benevolence were better than unadulterated selfishness, but after all it appears that the fabled horrors of the Colorado strike and the peaceful benevolence of the Arizona strike look exactly alike when viewed from an editorial chair three thousand miles away.

WALTER DOUGLAS.

Bisbee, Arizona.

[NOTE: THE NEW REPUBLIC has the highest authority for stating the facts as follows:

First, the strike was so remarkable for the absence of the usual disorder and violence that assertions to the contrary must be regarded as quibbling. When the managers returned to their homes after the settlement they were amazed at the signs that vandalism and violence had been completely lacking. Although they had left their homes unlocked and unguarded four months before, not an article had been disturbed. Piles of loose lumber had not been touched, although the strikers, the majority penniless and near starvation, had been forced to go into the mountains to cut fire-wood. Not ten dollars' worth of property had been destroyed, nor a bone broken, with the single exception that a locomotive engineer who piloted the engine on which the managers left the district was roughly handled on his return and suffered a broken collar bone. This was at the beginning of the strike, when the men believed that the managers were permanently abandoning their properties, and were therefore highly excited and embittered.

Mr. Douglas substantially charges the strikers with burning a concentrator mill, although he is careful to avoid lodging this charge in literal terms. The fact is that none of the managers was willing to say that the strikers set fire to the mill. The strikers asserted their belief that faulty insulation was responsible. But the significant fact is that it was the strikers who sounded the alarm, formed a bucket brigade to fetch water from a neighboring creek, and worked with might and main to check the blaze. This certainly was not the conduct of incendiaries, and was con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clusive evidence, in the minds of impartial investigators, that the fire was not incendiary.

Second, Mr. Douglas substantially denies that the action of the operators in not importing guards and strike-breakers was prompted by Governor Hunt's stand against this practise, and asserts in effect that this policy was voluntarily adopted by the companies. The facts are that Governor Hunt made a public address in the Clifton-Morenci district at the time when a strike seemed imminent, but before the managers had deserted the properties and before the situation had developed its distinguishing features. In this address he alluded to the notorious "bull pens" of Colorado, and announced that if any were to be established in the district, the authorities would see to it that any strike agitator who threatened violence would go into them, and that any manager or superintendent who imported trouble-makers and thus incited disorder would also go into them. This address, considered by impartial investigators from outside the state as the enunciation of an entirely fair and just policy, was construed by the mine managers as a hostile declaration, and they acted accordingly in formulating their policy.

Third, Mr. Douglas denies that the companies actually did attempt to import strike-breakers and that these men were detained at a nearby colony near the town of Duncan. In stating that the companies did import strike-breakers, THE NEW REPUBLIC relied on an official report to the Governor of Arizona from Adjutant General Harris, in command of the Arizona National Guard. Sent to Duncan to investigate the rumor, General Harris found that carloads of non-union workmen had arrived at Duncan from El Paso, in Texas. Convinced by this and other evidence that he considered conclusive, General Harris renewed orders to the militiamen in the strike zone to keep out strike-breakers, and reported to the governor that strike-breakers had actually been imported into the state and brought as far as Duncan. Later investigation by impartial men indicates that General Harris was in error, and that Mr. Douglas's statement is correct. When the strike began, or during the four months that followed, twelve per cent of the total working force deserted the strikers. This is regarded as a remarkably low proportion, when it is considered that the total relief funds available for the strikers for the entire period of four months amounted to only $1.25 for each person, while the companies offered the best of food and accommodations free of charge to any miner who would desert the strikers and go to the Duncan colony. Many of this twelve per cent of non-union men left the district when the strike began and went to El Paso, the nearest large town and labor market. In that city they got in touch with the managers, who induced them to return to Arizona and accept free food and lodging at the Duncan colony. It probably was the return of these former employees that deceived General Harris and led him to believe that strike-breakers were being imported.

The fourth point raised by Mr. Douglas concerns the propriety and justice of the course pursued by public officials in the strike district. It is true that Sheriff Cash and Deputy Sheriff Franz arrested several men whose conduct and utterances in behalf of the companies threatened to incite the half-starved strikers to violence, and after detaining them for a few hours in the upper rooms of the county building, urged them to leave town or ordered them to do so. Most of the work of actual administration was done by Deputy Sheriff Richard Franz. Mr. Franz is owner of a string of mercantile establishments in Clifton and other Arizona towns. He is credited with being a millionaire, meaning that he is one of the substantial citizens of the state. His conduct, as well as that of Governor Hunt and other officials, had the warmest approval and indorsement of the agents of the federal government who investigated the strike and brought about mediation. They felt that disorder and violence were avoided with the least possible interference with personal liberty. The only alternative would have been to bring in a large force of armed men and precipitate civil war, as in Colorado.

THE NEW REPUBLIC is informed that Mr. Douglas was not himself in the strike district at any time during the strike. The affidavits of which he speaks were published broadcast throughout the state by newspapers that accepted pay for printing them. They were vigorously denied by Governor Hunt, who depended for his information on the testimony of many officials and private citizens and who asserted that during the period when, according to the companies, a reign of terror existed, the mining communities were never more peaceful and orderly. It may be added that neither Governor Hunt nor any other principal to the controversy is the authority on whom THE NEW REPUBLIC has relied for the facts.

Since the publication of the article on January 22nd, the mining companies have receded from the refusal, maintained during the first four months of the strike, to make any concession until the men returned to work, and have signed an agreement which gives to the striking miners practically everything for which they asked, including handsome increases in pay and recognition of standing grievance committees. By this strike, so remarkable in every way, industrial absolutism of thirty years' standing in Greenlee County has given way to industrial democracy. To-day mutual understanding and good feeling prevail. Thanks for this are due to the solidarity and spirit of brotherhood among the strikers, the firm and just stand of Governor Hunt and the local peace officers, the wisdom and tact of the federal mediators, and the fine spirit in which the mine owners and managers at last acted on the demands of the men.—THE EDITORS.]

Wives and Birth Control

SIR: You may be interested in a little exploration I have just made into "the world's worst failure." About a month ago members of the Birth Control League asked me to get a dozen or more New York women to sign a statement of their view of Margaret Sanger and of their individual attitude towards the New York State law. The signers were to be mothers of two or more children and members of fairly well-known New York families. The statement reads:

1. We approve of Mrs. Sanger's course in publishing birth control articles.
2. We believe that such information should be readily accessible.
3. We have imparted birth control information.
4. We have practised birth control.

Out of about fifty women who were selected as meeting the aforesaid requirements and as being in addition liberal minded, six women agreed to sign the first three articles, and three women all four articles.

The grounds given for refusal to sign were various. Two or three women said they didn't know enough about the Sanger case to sign; they expressed no desire to know more. Several referred the whole situation to the medical profession, ignoring the fact that under the present New

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

York law the "discreet" physician is as much of a criminal as any woman who advises another, ignoring too the surmise that the discretion of the doctor is largely influenced either by his patient's income or by her capacity for nagging. I noticed too that women who urged that contraception was a matter for the doctors failed to say that in their own case they had always "left it" to the doctor, or that the patients in the gynecological wards of the hospitals did not use dangerous contraceptives for lack of information, or resorted to abortion.

But it was the more direct type of refusal to sign our statement, the more personal constraint on thought, the less covert form of self-protection, I found particularly interesting. "I'm just not the person for that sort of thing. . . ." "You're going to publish it in the newspapers! I couldn't stand that! . . ." "I consulted with my son, and he objected very much to the publicity. . . ." "My husband says until he gets this lawsuit off his hands I must do nothing conspicuous. . . ." "My husband says it would be improper for me as the wife of a judge to sign. . . ." "I'd like to sign it, but my husband is so conservative. . . ." "My husband laughed when I read him the statement. . . ."

He would laugh, of course. I laugh. You laugh. There are several things to laugh about in the circumstances. There is the law itself, for one thing. Then there is the attitude of the medical profession towards it. There is the attitude of the public at large. And who would deny that the very need of public testimony on so private a matter, testimony that more than anything else would contribute to lift the taboo safeguarding the present law and the present practice of class discrimination—who would deny that this need of testimony is highly laughable?

At times, testimony about the private life takes on a sufficiently public significance to free it from ridicule or the charge of bad taste. One night during the time of our Sanger canvas I went to an Osborne meeting at Carnegie Hall. The meeting was under the auspices of the Mutual Welfare League of Sing Sing prison, and on the platform sat a dozen or more ex-convicts of Sing Sing. They were there to testify to the virtue of prison reform methods. The most effectual way they could bear witness was to lay bare their own lives. To save other men they had to testify against themselves. Is the character of Sing Sing prison indeed more socializing, I asked myself that night, than the character of New York homes? Or is it that men are more self-sacrificing than women?

ELSIE CLEWS PARSONS.

New York City.

That Psychology Again

SIR: Two brilliant psychologists, Professor Münsterberg and Vernon Lee, will receive as well-founded a shock in reading, in your issue of February 26th, that they have endorsed the theory that æsthetic experience is a "product of frustrated action," as did your other educated readers in learning from Mr. Stein's article on Cezanne that their enjoyment of a picture is due to a frustration resulting from a contradiction of impulses. The definition of frustration as given by all dictionaries is as specific as is the psychology of frustration as accepted by all authorities; "to prevent from attaining a purpose," which is the uniform definition, implies in its psychology an element of conscious participation. It is quite evident, therefore, that the psychology as given by Mr. Stein in his original article, and his illustrative instance, do not accord with the quotation of Professor Münsterberg.

If the above-mentioned psychologists should confer with other specialists in their line, say Professors Santayana, Dewey, Titchener and Bosanquet, they would probably confess to each other that your office boy is just as well qualified as any of them to give a psychological explanation of æsthetic experience that would be founded on anything but the flimsiest kind of empirical data. The fact is, as specifically mentioned by Bosanquet, even those theories which have become current, such as the one mentioned by Professor Münsterberg, are as applicable to numerous physiological acts of non-æsthetic character as they are to æsthetic experience. In other words, that theory is not an explanation of æsthetic experience, but of certain experiences in general, and does not bear the scrutiny of scientific psychological analyses that would be based upon empirical or even theoretical data that is logical and convincing.

ALBERT C. BARNES.

Overbrook, Pennsylvania.

Preparedness for Foreign Trade

SIR: Your editorial entitled "Trade and the Flag" very properly emphasizes the need for a clearer comprehension of the inevitable relations between diplomacy and international finance. You point out, as Mr. Walter Lippmann has so ably done in his most recent work, that international friction has festered chiefly in the problems created by conflicting ambitions for the development of backward countries. In your reply to Mr. Howe it seems to me that certain additional considerations should be cited. The future of backward countries, moreover, will very likely be determined as one of the results of the European war.

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the scheme of profit distribution in this country is inequitable, the lot of those who now suffer from the present arrangement will be even less fortunate unless we succeed in maintaining and developing our foreign trade. Millions of our citizens are now profiting directly or indirectly from our business with the belligerents. The stimulation of industry and agriculture has brought work to thousands of those who a year and a half ago were seeking employment. The railways are congested with goods for export, and banks and private banking houses, through the extension of credit and the issue of foreign securities, are endeavoring to create a financial machinery without which this trade would be impossible. The employer, the stockholder, the banker, the speculator in war stocks may be deriving an undue proportion of the profits of this unprecedented activity. National prosperity may be unequally distributed, but it is shared by all. To maintain this prosperity we must continue our export trade. To do this we must be prepared to finance our customers. There may be merit in the suggestion that the cost of preparedness should be derived from direct taxation. Mr. Howe is wrong, however, when he contends, as he seems to do, that the protection of our foreign trade, the extension of which depends upon our ability to invest abroad, is in the sole interest of the capitalist class. Our foreign trade is essential to national prosperity and its protection is vital to the wellbeing of the farmer and the artisan, the small merchant and professional man, just as much as it is to the employer or the international financier.

The European war is likely to determine the lot of the so-called "backward countries." Conflicting national interests in the Balkans, in Turkey, in Persia, in China, in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Morocco and in Africa were the underlying cause of the present conflict. Their future will be settled by international agreement upon its conclusion. This settlement should assure the future of investment in these countries. Even if it does not, it is inconceivable that any American investor or group of investors would ever even suggest that the United States should go to war for the protection of American interests that may be created in these regions. Except in China by reason of our support of the open door policy, we make no pretension to any voice in the destiny of any of these regions. The only possible chance for conflict, therefore, would be with Japan in order to protect American rights in China. There is, however, little American investment in China to-day—and it is inconceivable that the future extension of our interest in China can involve us in hostilities with Japan. The inevitable losses that would result from such a struggle would more than counterbalance any possible profits that might be derived therefrom, either by Japan or the United States. American interests in China will be best conserved by international coöperation in the interest of China and of the policy of the open door.

As regards South and Central America, if a clash should come, and this is unlikely, it would be to protect Pan-Americanism and the Monroe Doctrine against European or Japanese aggression, rather than to secure from a South American government the settlement of claims of American investors. The republics of South America can no longer be included in your category of backward peoples. By virtue of their treaties with the United States, Haiti, San Domingo and Nicaragua have been or are about to be placed on a sound financial basis which will make them fields for investment and not speculative exploitation. Costa Rica, Salvador and Guatemala have enjoyed excellent credit over a period of years. None of them can be considered backward in your interpretation of this term. Mexico alone remains. The European governments are willing, or appear to be, that we should have a free hand in the solution of this problem. We have been unwilling to go to war in the past to protect our investments in Mexico and it is unlikely that we shall do so in the future. It may be that some sort of financial protectorate will be established, as was done in the case of Cuba, but this will remove rather than aggravate the danger of hostilities.

Granted that the foregoing statements are correct, it is impossible to attack "preparedness" on the ground that it has been devised in the interest solely of the capitalist class. It would seem, moreover, that the problem of American investment in backward countries is already in a fair way towards solution.

JOSEPH H. MILLER.

Schenectady, New York.

Congressmen Not Criminals

SIR: The vehemence of the abuse which has been heaped on the insurgent Congressmen is astonishing—and alarming. Most of us believe they were wrong in their advocacy of a warning resolution. But can we not separate the two questions involved—whether their view was correct, and what course sincere and patriotic men holding their view ought to take?

We have no right to assume that their motives were purely political. If a Congressman honestly believes that the President of the United States has adopted a course of action which may lead the country into war, a course of action which he may even believe to be prejudicial to the best interests of the country, and which he may believe the country as a whole does not favor, what ought he to do about it? It is no answer to say that the questions involved are of such fundamental significance as to warrant the President in taking an uncompromising stand. The Congressman does not think so, and the question is, what ought *he* to do? He may know that his opposition will embarrass the President—and he may conscientiously feel that the President's course is such that he ought to be embarrassed. Is the Congressman therefore unpatriotic and his action seditious?

Should not Congressmen express the faith that is in them even when that faith is not ours, and when we think that expression dangerous? For them, to have been silent would have been treachery. For them, it would have been unpatriotic. There is no more dangerous and damnable slogan than "My country right or wrong." To support the President when we believe him wrong is not true patriotism. True patriotism is loyalty to an ideal of one's country, not to her present faults. We would not call it true patriotism if a member of the German Reichstag who believed the sinking of the Lusitania wrong had kept silent about it because, forsooth, it might have embarrassed his government in its negotiations with the United States. The cases are parallel. The difference is that most of us would have agreed with the German, whereas we don't agree with these Americans. The kind of abuse which has been hurled at the dissenting Congressmen seems to assume that their action gave evidence of a kind of moral turpitude.

It is surprising that in a democracy there should be such condemnation of individuals who express dissent. We have had implicit confidence in Mr. Wilson largely because he has so perfectly represented the feeling of the majority of us. But we might have a President who did not. A few months ago we were wildly denouncing those who insisted on a sterner attitude toward Germany. We called it a crime to "rock the boat." Now it is the dissenters of the other wing whom we abuse. Can we not disagree with their views, call them fools if we will, but at the same time realize that their patriotism is as real as that of those of us who happen to agree with the President? If dissent is a crime, what is the meaning of democracy?

LEWIS S. GANNETT.

New York City.

Believes in Integration

SIR: The article in THE NEW REPUBLIC of February 19th on public ownership ("Integrated America") is the most fundamental, constructive and practical suggestion to bring order out of anarchy and chaos that has come to my notice. I suggest that you hammer away at this idea relentlessly in and out of season until you have made an indelible impression, for as eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, so patient effort and persistency is the conqueror of all difficulties and obstacles. I have heard it said and I believe it true that a drop of water will wear a hole in solid rock if the process continues for a sufficient length of time. I am sending ten cents in stamps for which please send me the NEW REPUBLIC, February 19th; I wish to use it for propaganda. I will send in my subscription later for I am out of work now. For your information I will say I am a foreigner by birth, an American by choice, a socialist by conviction, a laboring man by force of circumstances. I have no education except such as I get from newspapers and magazines.

J. SCHAFFER.

San Diego, California.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Finances of Mexico

SIR: Commissioner Frederic C. Howe, in his article "Incomplete Preparedness" in the issue of February 26th, ably shows the danger of the policy "that the flag of a country should follow the investments of its subjects." In criticizing this doctrine of divorcing government from finance, your editorial illustrates its disapproval by discussing the financial situation in Mexico. You quote from a circumstantial report in the New York *Times* that General Carranza will be refused loans in Wall Street, that Mexican credit is ruined almost beyond repair, that it is only a question of weeks or months before the government falls, that the bankers are unwilling to lose money in Mexico through investments or loans without protection from the United States, and therefore that the Carranza government is fated.

Possibly the readers of THE NEW REPUBLIC may disagree with this conclusion and uphold Mr. Howe's position upon the consideration of the following facts: New York bankers are not averse to lending money to Mexico. In proof of this, let me remind you that last September the Bankers' Club of New York gave a banquet in honor of Carranza's envoys, Luis Cabrera, Minister of Finance, Roberto Pasquera and Juan Amador, at which they offered to loan money to the Constitutionalist government. The loan was not accepted, for it has been decreed by Carranza that no attempt to borrow money from any source will be undertaken until after the constitutional convention in September, 1916, when the government will be legally and firmly established. The bankers have advanced, however, $10,000,000 to the state of Yucatan for special purposes.

Although a prominent member of the New York Bankers Association, in an interview in the New York *Sun*, frankly stated that "If the bankers do not get control of the Mexican customs, intervention will be brought about," it is positively stated that Carranza will withstand this demand, as he has all others that have for their motive the selfish aggrandizement of a privileged group rather than the general welfare of all his fellow countrymen.

To quote directly from the *Journal of American Bankers*, February issue, a more reliable authority on finance than a *Times* editorial, "The Republic of Mexico may have needed a revolution to overthrow its political system but it certainly does not need an economic revolution for its banking institutions. Although the months of October, 1913, to February, 1914, constituted the most disastrous period of banking in Mexico, by April, 1915, the banks had shown substantial improvements in their cash holdings and a large decrease in their debts (in the Banco Nacional an increase of $9,331,367.76)." "A comparison of the balances of all the banks shows approximately $83,000,000 cash to meet a circulation of $225,589,000. . . . The amount of bullion to meet the notes and deposit accounts reaches a percentage such as the Bank of the Netherland exercises in limiting its circulation." These statements demonstrate very clearly the recuperative power of the banking system of Mexico and its potentialities in the reconstructive epoch now taking place in Mexico.

We must realize that Mexico is not bankrupt, that large as her internal and external debt sounds ($250,000,000 for 15,000,000 inhabitants) it is lower than that of Japan, Germany or even the United States. The Mexican debt is $5.00 per capita, while that of the United States in 1909 was $10.76. She is not on the brink of ruin; she is far from it.

Her coveted wealth is her great danger. Men of all climes are ready and waiting to pour money into Mexico in return for concessions. They are in quest of privileges, grants of land, gold, silver, oil and coal deposits, railroad and electric light concessions, gambling and other vice exemptions, and monopolies in trade. This is what the financial and industrial leaders from all over the world seek. This is what Commissioner Howe fears if diplomacy is converted into an agency of finance, and if the armies and navies of the great powers are used in the future, as they have been repeatedly in the past, for the protection of the financial interests of foreign investors in those countries.

Lincoln Steffens, now in Mexico City, writing in the *Accion Mundial* of February 5th, warns Mexico of this dangerous monster—privilege. "You, a younger people, have had the spirit to rise up and fight this thing which oppresses us all. You have met it with force in the field of battle, and with force have driven it—where? Back to New York, Havana and London, and—out of sight of Mexico. This is a great achievement. It is an inspiration to all the peoples of the world who have heard of the triumph of the Revolution. If the Mexican people will go on, farther than any people have ever gone, and do what has never yet been done; if they will dig down under the plant to the roots of the universal evil—dig down and dig up and abolish the privileges that rule and hurt all men and all governments and all society—if in their youth and their courage and their hour of triumph they will do this, they will save and liberate, not only Mexico, but the whole world. For the example of that sort of a revolution would be irresistible."

However, our bankers may not be as ready to lend money, then, as they are today!

MRS. JAMES P. WARBASSE.

Brooklyn, New York.

Possible Tax for Carranza

SIR: Your article in a recent issue entitled "Trade and the Flag" at one point I think halts halfway.

Contending that the United States ought to take positive steps toward reëstablishing order in Mexico, you point out that after all, the American financiers control the situation. They can "pass sentence of death" upon any Mexican régime simply by refusing to extend it credit. "Without credit what can Carranza do?" He cannot levy taxes, you say, upon his own people without causing more revolt.

It seems to me you have overlooked the vital fact that different taxes operate quite differently. Carranza dare not levy taxes upon industry and the products of labor. These do indeed stir up widespread discontent. But a tax upon land values is another matter. Land values constitute a monopoly, and the entire burden of a tax upon them falls upon the monopolist. Such a tax might under circumstances be beneficial, even though the proceeds therefrom were thrown into the sea. Should Carranza tax land only, he would open up fields of employment to the Mexican worker, and provide himself with an independent source of revenue.

If newspaper accounts are true, it is already uncomfortable for the land-grabber in Mexico. The cost of supporting country schools, we are told, is paid by the landowner. Yucatan is said to have abolished in due form all private property in land. If that sort of thing keeps up, we of the United States shall have to import a few Mexicans to teach us the true basis of economic freedom.

MALCOM C. BURKE.

Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Things

FOR your pleasure and for mine I am going to hang this room with landscapes by Henry James. To each I shall give its date. Suppose we begin with "The American," published in 1878. Christopher Newman had been awake most of the night on the train from Paris to Geneva. "Toward morning slumber really came, as an effect of mental rather than of physical fatigue. He slept for a couple of hours, and at last, waking, found his eyes resting upon one of the snow-powdered peaks of the Jura, behind which the sky was just reddening with the dawn. But he saw neither the cold mountain nor the warm sky; his consciousness began to throb again, on the very instant, with a sense of his wrong." Here is a bit of Fleurières, the village where Newman went to see Madame de Cintré after his brother's death: "The church was simply the former chapel of the castle, fronting upon its grass-grown court, which, however, was of generous enough width to have given up its quaintest corner to a little graveyard. Here the very headstones themselves seemed to sleep, as they slanted into the grass; the patient elbow of the rampart held them together on one side, and in front, far beneath their mossy lids, the green plains and blue distances stretched away." From "The Portrait of a Lady," dated 1881, I take Osmond's villa, "an ancient-looking villa which stood on the summit of an olive-muffled hill, outside of the Roman gate of Florence. The villa was a long, rather blank-looking structure, with the far-projecting roof which Tuscany loves, and which, on the hills that encircle Florence, when looked at from a distance, makes so harmonious a rectangle with the straight, dark, definite cypresses that usually rise, in groups of three or four, beside it."

Though I cannot, at this moment, date "The Private Life" exactly, the volume in which it appears was published in 1893, so I suppose one is safe in assigning this picture to ninety-one or ninety-two: "The hour and the scene were one of those impressions which make up a little, in Switzerland, for the modern indignity of travel—the promiscuities and vulgarities, the station and the hotel, the gregarious patience, the struggle for a scrappy attention, the reduction to a numbered state. The high valley was pink with the mountain rose, the cool air as fresh as if the world were young. There was a faint flush of afternoon on undiminished snows, and the fraternizing tinkle of the unseen cattle came to us with a cropped and sun-warmed odour. The balconied inn stood on the very neck of the sweetest pass in the Oberland, and for a week we had had company and weather." Perhaps I ought to say here, before quoting from "The Turn of the Screw," that in my opinion something befell Henry James not long before 1898, when this story was published, that about this time his apprenticeship ended and his greatness began. Such an opinion might easily lead one both to choose things which would support it, and to be unfair to the earlier landscape when compared to this: "In the first weeks the days were long; they often, at their finest, gave me what I used to call my own hour, the hour when, for my pupils, tea-time and bed-time having come and gone, I had, before my final retirement, a small interval alone. Much as I liked my companions, this hour was the thing in the day I liked most; and I liked it best of all when, as the light faded, or rather, I should say, the day lingered and the last call of the last birds sounded, in a flushed sky, from the old trees. . . ." Something happens to this place and this time when the narrator first sees the apparition of Peter Quint: "It was as if, while I took in—what I did take in—all the rest of the scene had been stricken with death. I can hear again, as I write, the intense hush in which the sounds of evening dropped. The rooks stopped cawing in the golden sky, and the friendly hour lost, for the minute, all its voice." Of about the same period, of 1899, is the beginning of the fifth book of "The Awkward Age": "The lower windows of the great white house, which stood high and square, opened to a wide flagged terrace, the parapet of which, an old balustrade of stone, was broken in the middle of its course by a flight of stone steps that descended to a wonderful garden. The terrace had the afternoon shade and fairly hung over the prospect that dropped away and circled it—the prospect, beyond the series of gardens, of scattered, splendid trees and green glades, an horizon mainly of woods. Nanda Brookenham, one day at the end of July, coming out to find the place unoccupied as yet by other visitors, stood there awhile with an air of happy possession. She moved from end to end of the terrace, pausing, gazing about her, taking in with a face that showed the pleasure of a brief independence the combination of delightful things—of old rooms, with old decorations that gleamed and gloomed through the high windows, of old gardens that squared themselves in the wide angles of old walls, of wood-walks rustling in the afternoon breeze and stretching away to further reaches of solitude and summer."

The last three pictures are from "The Wings of the Dove," and are all of Venice: "Not yet so much as this morning had she felt herself sink into possession; gratefully glad that the warmth of the Southern summer was still in the high, florid rooms, palatial chambers where hard, cool pavements took reflections in their lifelong polish, and where the sun on the stirred sea-water, flickering up through open windows, played over the painted 'subjects' in the splendid ceilings—medallions of purple and brown, of brave old melancholy colour, medals as of old reddened gold, embossed and beribboned, all toned with time and all flourished and scolloped and gilded about, set in their great moulded and figured concavity (a nest of white cherubs, friendly creatures of the air), and appreciated by the aid of that second tier of smaller lights, straight openings to the front, which did everything, even with the Baedekers and photographs of Milly's party dreadfully meeting the eye, to make of the place an apartment of state." The next is Venice in storm: "This manner, while they stood for a long minute facing each other over all they didn't say, played a part as well in the sudden jar to Densher's protected state. It was a Venice all of evil that had broken out for them alike, so that they were together in their anxiety, if they really could have met on it; a Venice of cold, lashing rain from a low black sky, of wicked wind raging through narrow passes, of general arrest and interruption, with the people engaged in all the water-life huddled, stranded and wageless, bored and cynical, under archways and bridges." Last of all is Venice when this storm is over: "The near Thursday, coming nearer and bringing Sir Luke Strett, brought also blessedly an abatement of other rigours. The weather changed, the stubborn storm yielded, and the autumn sunshine, baffled for many days, but now hot and almost vindictive, came into its own again and, with an almost audible paean, a suffusion of bright sound that was one with the bright colour, took large possession. Venice glowed and plashed and called and chimed again; the air was like a clap of hands, and the scattered pinks, yellows, blues, sea-greens, were like a hanging out of vivid stuffs, a laying down of fine carpets."

P. L.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Great Game

The First Hundred Thousand, by "Ian Hay." Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. $1.50.

ONE wonders a little how a German officer would regard this book. Captain Ian Hay Beith enlisted at the outbreak of the war as a sub-lieutenant in the Argyle and Sutherland Highlanders. His chronicle thus begins with "the first hundred thousand" of Kitchener's army. It takes us through the training at Aldershot, through the "long, laborious, sometimes heart-breaking winter," up to the Big Push last September. The narrative ends with the glories and tragedies of the great offensive. Because it is a clear, honest account of a volunteer British regiment one wonders how it would seem to an alert soldier on the opposite side.

What strikes a reader who knows nothing of war is the bright amateurishness of it all. In a way one admires this tremendously. Soulful talk would be trying. One can believe that "none of us care to talk, even privately, about the Dream of Honour and the Hope of Glory." But war, after all, is war. It is not a game or a sport. And Captain Beith's spirit is the spirit of the British public school, with a strong suggestion of *Punch*.

It is supremely natural that the war should have tapped just this spirit in England. On the Continent there was conscription for a long time. The tradition of manliness, strange though it may seem to a robust Britisher thinking of a pigmy Frenchman, has been the tradition of arms. In England, for some generations, the proof of racial manliness has been the vogue of outdoor games. If this was true in Wellington's time, it has become more emphatically true ever since. The only way England has kept in readiness for its present emergency, in fact, has been by keeping alive the practise of sports. But to go from the playground to the battlefield in the very spirit of the playground suggests a lack of imagination. And this lack of imagination sticks out all over this volume. In age Captain Beith is not a schoolboy. He is a man of forty. But one feels throughout that it is as a brave, simple, sporting schoolboy he conceives his difficult mission at the front. So, one imagines, he must have written novels in time of peace—pleasant novels, no doubt, but not the kind of novels that were really a matter of life and death. However one may feel about the Germans, one may be sure they do not take their work in this spirit. And that seems an advantage in a warfare gruesomely scientific.

How affectionately Captain Beith catches the boyish idiom of the British officer one may perhaps guess from this bit of an episode. A polite engineer comes out of the darkness to walk Ayling, the machine-gunner, around a new position.

"'I'll take you along the road a bit, first.' . . .

"Ayling thanked him, and stepped somewhat higher than usual as a bullet struck the ground at his feet.

"'Extraordinary how few casualties one gets,' continued the Sapper chattily. 'Their snipers go potting away all night, but they don't often get anybody. By the way, they have a machine-gun trained on this road, but they only loose it off every second night. Methodical beggars!'

"'Did they loose it off last night?'

"'No. To-night's the night. Have you finished here?'

"'Yes, thanks!'

"'Right-o!'"

This barely suggests the tone. But it recurs again and again.

"'There's a parrty of Gairmans gotten oot o' their trenches, sirr. Will we open fire?'

"'Go and have a look at 'em, like a good chap, Wagger,' says the Major. 'I want to finish this letter.'"

In the same nonchalant spirit bombs become "whizz-bangs," a big gun becomes Minnie, the official Intelligence Summary of the Division becomes "Comic Cuts." "'Why in thunder can't you keep your filthy tea-kettle in its own place, instead of bringing it here to draw fire?'" the machine-gunner is asked. And the ardent trench-mortar officer is bullied in the same way. "'No, you *don't*, my lad!' announces the Major. 'Not if I can help it! Take it away! Take your darned liver-pill out of this! Burn it! Bury it! Eat it! But not here! Creep away!'"

The author enjoys reporting this blitheness. It is not fair to him, however, to intimate that he belittles the soldier's task. The first job of Kitchener's army was "pounding a mob into a regiment in a few months" and Captain Beith does not underestimate it. It is indeed with reverence for the military traditions that he composes his story. By characterizing a number of the recruits in an amusing and friendly way and by personalizing most of the officers he does make us feel at home with his regiment and he gives us a keen sense of its human contingencies. We begin with the sad humors of squad drill. We meet volunteers from plough, pit and dock, most of them new to discipline, inclined to rebel against it and slowly acquiring a group consciousness. The code of the officers' mess is suggested, with its blend of comradeships and deferences. The processes of regimentation are amusedly sketched—route march, target practice, manoeuvers, "fatigue." And there is shrewd satire of the war department and the people up above. But because of the airy geniality of the tone employed, and the underlying conviction that this preparation has made a "real live regiment," one is at least baffled. Perhaps the class humor with which the recruits are described—Ogg and Hogg, Cosh and Tosh, Mucklewame, Budge, M'Leary and even M'Snape—has something to do with a sense that Captain Beith has not quite clinched with the difficult task of describing the war.

The Cause, he says in one place, was "never entirely forgotten." This one believes. But the humorous reasons which his comrades give for enlisting leave one a little cold. They reinforce the pervading air of affectation. This has nothing to do, of course, with Captain Beith's own performance. It is characteristic of him that he has avoided centering our attention on his personal appearance by casting his narrative in the third person, but we know from the foreword that he has, "for some mysterious reason," been awarded the military cross. That he and his regiment were gloriously gallant one is warmly conscious. If one is disappointed it is mainly because their deeper emotions are not presented with success. One does not doubt for a second the sportsmanlike attitude of these men. One only doubts their willingness to accept the psychic as well as the physical clash of the war. To avoid that is probably instinctive. Humor is a great buffer of the soul. But the men who meet the war without any such buffer seem a good deal more like sentient human beings. They emerge from a charming but limited way of taking life into an impressiveness worthy of their behavior.

It may seem humorless to ask the well-bred unofficial chronicler of a Kitchener regiment to do more than select amusing and picturesque incidents; to account in some degree for the bigness of his adventure and his empire's risks. It may seem worse than humorless, it may seem priggish. But pleasant though Captain Beith's narrative is, it does

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not convey a fine total sense of his adventure, his army and his empire. It has for a grave event a too-familiar imperturbability, an air of preserving style at the expense of sincere response. The British style is a charming thing in its proper place. It is the best thing the world has ever seen in afternoon-tea Olympianism. But the best men in the regular army do not foster it. They know war too well and hate defeat too much. It is a sentimentalism to set forth the battlefield as a lawn-party Olympia. And if Captain Beith had been able to see this, he would have written a book more consonant with the infinitely valiant and beautiful spirit of men like himself.

F. H.

The Mechanics of Democracy

Electoral Reform in England and Wales, by Charles Seymour. New Haven: Yale University Press. $2.25.

FOR the most part it is in results that a democratic community displays its interest. What men do grips their imagination far more than the patient study of the process of achievement. Few things, as a consequence, are more obscure than the technique of democratic machinery. A striking treatise by Sir Courtenay Ilbert, some pregnant hints from Mr. Graham Wallas, a stimulating essay by Professor Beard, a fine analysis by Mr. F. A. Cleveland—these are the typical landmarks in a region of which no scientific survey has yet been made. For, to put a blunt question, do we as yet know anything at all adequate of the causes of the widespread dissatisfaction with representative government? Why is it, to take an obvious instance, that the democratization of the English electorate has accomplished so little of the prophecies foretold by its ardent advocates? We read perpetually of supposed epochs in the history of the English race in 1832, in 1867, in 1884, until the very word grows hateful to the ears of an accurate observer. We talk of political freedom as connected with the electoral symbol of citizenship only to find that men still hug their chains. Then, slowly, there dawns upon us the dim realization of the fact that liberty is more subtle than acts of Parliament would have us believe. Men are not made free by declarations of independence, any more than they gain rights by our assertion of their existence. We begin to see that we must concentrate our attention upon method if the thing achieved is to find effective translation into terms of the event.

Professor Seymour has analyzed in this admirable book the history of electoral methods in England during the nineteenth century. A dry enough topic in all conscience! We all know our Pickwick, and we all have cast our vote and know how the thing is done. Yet once the display of our power is made, a sense of profound disappointment somehow takes the vitality out of our political interest, and we do not repeat the procedure. What is the cause? The English middle class won their freedom in 1832. Men predicted revolution. Sir James Scarlett prophesied that the Whigs would pay for their sin on the day of judgment. Yet beyond an increase in the number of the electorate, there were no signs of vast change. Men still invested in the funds; trade-unionists were still sent to prison for conspiracy; Oxford still excluded Dissenters from its doors. In 1867, Disraeli leaped lightly in the dark, and established household suffrage. Everyone knew it was an election dodge; Robert Lowe said it was meanly pandering to the baser appetites of mankind. Yet in 1868 Mr. Gladstone came smoothly into power to pass bills which in nowise reflected a change in the character of the electorate. Seventeen years later he himself enfranchised the agricultural laborer. The old, outworn ghosts were dragged from the parliamentary cupboard. The rustics were ignorant, they were cupidinous, they had no stake in the country; a hideous radicalism—witness Joseph Arch—would result from so preposterous a step. And it was clearly these dangerous revolutionaries who stood firmly against Irish freedom in 1886.

We have hardly penetrated to the roots of this amazing paradox. When we at last come to possess an adequate political psychology—Mr. Graham Wallas has sketched its beginnings—when we have some kind of frequency-curves of the distribution of class characteristics, we shall know part at least of the explanation. Until that day the historian must trust to himself. He must examine, as Mr. Seymour has so patiently and skilfully done, the results of stupid and complicated systems of registration, of electoral corruption, of intimidation, of the manifold possibilities that lie in the redistribution of seats. It then becomes clear that under the forms of 1832 it was still possible to continue the processes of the eighteenth century. A regal duke of Newcastle could still do what he liked with his own. Even Bright and Cobden did not scruple to disfranchise thousands by making objection to their qualifications under circumstances which made rebuttal impossible. Aristocratic control was barely diminished after 1832. It was still great after 1867, since only the boroughs were in any way removed from their influence, and the great industrial centers did not obtain the representation that was their due. Disraeli, after all, depended on the counties. The reform act of 1884 and the redistribution act of the following year did most to end the happy passion for control of which the English nobility so slowly shook itself free; for then the ballot had struck the ground from under the feet of intimidators, while Lord James of Hereford had given Englishmen a corrupt practises act of which they may rightly be proud. By that time, moreover, the results of popular education were beginning to be manifest. Whatever the defects of the act of 1870, it taught the majority of men that the path to an intelligent understanding of the world about them was not closed to all below a certain income. That discovery ought to rank with Newton's differential calculus and Darwin's natural selection. For it evened up to the normal man—like David a reality who has slain his tens of thousands—the fact that he could use Parliament to satisfy his desires. The increasing collectivism of the English state is only the effect of his realization.

Mr. Young makes abundantly clear the fact that the relation between electoral psychology and electoral machinery is so delicate and so little adjustable that we had better bestir ourselves to its improvement. John Stuart Mill saw this, as he sometime saw most other things, when he advocated the voluntary electorate of Mr. Hare. It is certainly obvious that we can no longer leave the average elector throttled in the grasp of the party system. We badly need minority representation. We can only obtain it by the abandonment of the single-member constituency about which, after all, there is nothing divinely ordained. We must also seek to put some serious kind of qualification to the member we select. There is no reason in the world why we should continue to leave Congress to the mercy of third-rate lawyers, and the House of Commons to the romantic social ambitions of retired millionaires. The more we survey the problem of electioneering, the more is it clear that the emphasis must be not so much on the people who choose as on the people chosen. Our democracy, in fact,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be an aristocracy by delegation. How best to secure that end is the main problem in the technique of government.

There is only one quarrel with Mr. Seymour. He has written a useful and deeply interesting book, but he has written it almost entirely from official sources. Hansard and Parliamentary Papers give us much. His analysis of them is full and of permanent value. But Mr. Seymour knows far better than I can pretend to do that there is a valuable pamphlet and periodical literature on these questions which greatly needs revivification. What were the trade-unionists thinking during these years? What had the Chartists to say in those badly printed little journals from which the fastidious reader still shrinks in half-disgust? The history of the nineteenth century, even the monographs on its history, must now give us some insight into the common thoughts of the common people. No one can pretend to have told us truly what there is to tell who shall not have written down annals none the less eloquent because of their tragic brevity.

H. J. L.

Modified Feminism

Life and Gabriella, by Ellen Glasgow. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co. $1.35.

MISS Ellen Glasgow is the most reasonable of women, as well as the most conscientious of novelists. Most writers, even the ablest, are afflicted with a betraying bias toward the special predicament of one sex or the other, which makes unlocking their inventions with the Freudian key a game belittling to their perception. But it is impossible to convict Miss Glasgow of absurdity or malice or want of humor. If Gabriella represents Miss Glasgow's dream of womanhood—and one may be quite certain that she does—it is a commonsense dream. Gabriella is without any of the adventitious aids; she hasn't beauty or talent or fortunate circumstances to lean on. Hers is a logical success, and a moderate one. For Miss Glasgow wants us to see how far courage can go toward carrying a woman of good instincts safely over the jumps of contemporary life, but she doesn't want us to see it going farther than it can; she refuses to victimize us. And so Gabriella is just a nice girl with courage added; with, indeed, as deep-lying a conviction as Miss Glasgow's own that life is what you make it, coupled with a steady determination to make it worth while.

All the differences between Gabriella and her mother, who was a southern woman of the admirably helpless sort, and her sister Jane, who made marriage an exercise in forgiving her irresponsible husband, take their origin in Gabriella's courage. Gabriella is outraged by Jane's acquiescence. The spectacle of her sister's histrionic capacity, which made the unfaithfulness of Charles the occasion of concealing, in a pageant of moral superiority, her complete economic dependence on him, stirs Gabriella to conquer her world. Gabriella hadn't the spectator's detachment with which to see, any more than she had Miss Glasgow's instinct and skill to render, the comedy in which the contest of Charles and Jane was so rich. She saw only the moral and she had to act. With a fine ruthlessness she broke through the convention of gentility in which she had been brought up and landed squarely on her own feet in Brandywine & Plummer's millinery department.

Nevertheless, Gabriella was a woman. She fell romantically in love with George. She was agreed with him, Miss Glasgow writes, "that the object of their marriage was to make George happy." But a daily experience of George's futility cured Gabriella of this woman's weakness. When George was unfaithful Gabriella no longer loved him, and she had no more stomach for compromise in her own case than she had had in Jane's. She set resolutely and at once about the task of making a living for herself and the children. She managed it from the first, though narrowly, and thereafter steadily gained in her power to bend life to her purpose. It was the triumph of the whole woman, when, at thirty-eight, securely in charge of a Fifth Avenue shop, she escaped the last remnant of snobbery and married O'Hara, who was neither cultivated in the northern sense nor gentlemanly in the southern sense, but who had a tempered soul, like her own.

Passion after adolescence is the one danger which Miss Glasgow has not permitted Gabriella, the one jump she does not have to take. What would have happened if some time in those ten years of going on and up Gabriella had met a man and a circumstance which had turned all her courage against her determination to manage life? Miss Glasgow leads us firmly away from this consideration.

"Life and Gabriella" is a sound novel, the work of a writer who knows her task and does it. But it has, of course, the defect as well as the advantage of the sturdy intelligence which produced it. Dealing always with the very stuff of woman's modern adventure, it is not adventurous. Miss Glasgow leans backward in her rectitude. She is so determined not to play life up that she gives us, often, the effect of playing it down.

L. C.

TIFFANY & CO.

ANTIQUE ENGLISH SILVER AND REPRODUCTIONS

FIFTH AVENUE AND 37TH STREET NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Is Insanity?

Who Is Insane? By Stephen Smith, A. M. M. D. LL. D., New York: The Macmillan Company. $1.25.

IT is hardly possible to write a dull book on insanity. In the exploration of that dangerous darkness which encircles the rational life of all of us who does not feel a quick interest? The subject has a fascination that is touched with fear, for our own lucid flame sometimes flickers perilously in the winds of disappointment or disease. As former Commissioner of Lunacy of the State of New York, Mr. Stephen Smith found a rich vein of personal experiences with the inmates of our asylums, and from it he has extracted many anecdotal nuggets. They make his book vivid and living. In hardly any sense a scientific book, it is much more than a meagre monograph. Somewhat turgid in style and none too sharp in its critical distinctions, this little volume is of the kind that kindles the layman's hope and justifies the scientist's patience. It is an empirical statement that insanity is to a much higher degree functional than it is organic—which means that it is more amenable to control and cure than we had ever dared expect. Mr. Smith does not lay this down *a priori,* he gives case after case in substantiation. He shows how a single word at the proper moment may be all the "cure" needed. He proves beyond a reasonable doubt that even the use of the word "insane" asylum has a disastrous effect on the inmates of that dreaded sanctuary, how the substitution of the euphemistic phrase "hospital for nervous disorders" is worth more than several high-salaried alienists. For the millions of cells of which our body is made up are to a large extent dependent for their growth, as certain of our congenital instincts are dependent for their expression, upon the proper external stimulation.

In a child born blind the neurones which cluster around the cortical centers of vision will remain inert and lifeless. Perform an operation on the optic nerves so that the stimulation of light reaches these centers, and at once these neurones change their character. They begin to grow, to absorb nutriment from the blood, to show activity. The toxins which form in the great colon—that popular "culture" seat—derange the whole nervous system. In fact, the physiological background of mental disorders furnishes the strongest possible argument in favor of curative measures for dealing with insanity. We know too much to have to throw up our hands in despair.

In the old days the insane were looked upon as outcast and treated as such. That attitude towards the insane—still extant in certain near-Eastern countries—confirms them in their malady where it does not actually increase their numbers. As late as the Civil War mechanical restraint was the recognized method of treatment of the insane in this country. We have long since outgrown that stupidity, but the enormous number of the "feeble-minded" in our state institutions to-day makes pertinent the question whether the mild custodial indifferentism in vogue now cannot be replaced by intelligent curative methods which will reduce the burden that we all take our share in supporting. Mr. Smith's answer is an unqualified yes. He outlines the general scheme of such methods and is not barren of specific suggestions. It is an encouraging and hopeful book, based on reality. Yet if only it awakened a new tolerance, if it but helped ever so little to dispel one of the blackest superstitions that has ever beclouded the human mind, it would still have been worth writing.

H. S.

The $100,000 Man Who Went to School Again

This is an inspiring story of a big-minded business man. Despite his wide experience, despite his huge income, he left his business for a year while he *learned the fundamental principles* behind the problems of his complicated business.

Many Big Men Doing the Same

The brainiest men in America today are doing what he did, for exactly the same reason he did it. The only difference is that they do not now have to leave their business as this man did. Instead, the Alexander Hamilton Institute now brings this business training right to their desks or to their home reading tables.

The Advisory Council

Judge E. H. Gary, Chairman of the U. S. Steel Corporation; Frank A. Vanderlip, President of the National City Bank; John Hays Hammond, the great engineer; Joseph French Johnson, Dean of the New York University School of Commerce; and Jeremiah W. Jenks, the statistician and economist, compose the Advisory Council.

How Men Make Good

What our Modern Business Course and Service has done for its 35,000 subscribers will probably never be known in its entirety. But daily there filter into the headquarters in New York many intensely human stories, showing how men are helped. One day you hear of a brilliant lad of twenty-two, in a big New York bank, rising to a $9,500 job and giving credit to the Institute for his success. The next day a factory manager writes that the Course has just helped him save his firm $7,000 a year, and that "a fair slice" of this went to increase his salary. Or a man in a western concern tells how he saved the firm $37,000 a year *by one suggestion,* and what happened then to *his salary.*

These are only typical cases. There are literally hundreds of them described in the 128 page book, "Forging Ahead in Business," a copy of which will be sent you, *free.*

ALEXANDER HAMILTON INSTITUTE
252 Astor Place New York City

Send me "Forging Ahead in Business"—FREE

Name .....

Business Address .....

Business Position .....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED